

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1361554



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

2104

90
116

Church

STUDIES IN MODERN CHRISTENDOM

BEING A SERIES OF LECTURES DELIVERED
IN CONNEXION WITH THE
LIVERPOOL BOARD OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
LENT TERM 1909

BY
W. FIDDIAN MOULTON, M.A.
AND
W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.HIST.S.

London

ROBERT CULLEY

25-35 CITY ROAD, AND 26 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

FIRST EDITION 1910

To
JOHN T. MITCHELL

RECTOR OF WAVERTREE

TO WHOSE ENTHUSIASM AND UNFLAGGING ZEAL

THE LIVERPOOL BOARD OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

OWES SO MUCH BOTH IN RESPECT OF

ITS BEING AND ITS WELL-BEING

THIS LITTLE VOLUME IS INSCRIBED WITH SINCERE REGARD

INTRODUCTION

A FEW words of explanation are perhaps needed with reference to the appearance of this volume. In the autumn of 1908 the writers were asked by the Executive Committee of the Liverpool Board of Biblical Studies to give, during the Lent Term of 1909, a course of lectures dealing with the History of the Christian Church since the Reformation. The choice of a subject so vast and many-sided was due to the fact that the syllabus of the Board is shaped by the requirements of the Dublin B.D. course; and the text-book suggested in the Dublin prospectus was Cheetham's well-known volume. It was, of course, impossible for the lecturers to do justice to such a period in ten lectures. All that they could do was to select what seemed to them to be the most important phases of the ecclesiastical developments of the period; and to view them, not so much from the standpoint of the chronicler, as from that of their place in the religious progress of the centuries. Thus, it is hoped, there will be seen to be a unity of purpose and idea, if not of chronological sequence.

This little volume is inscribed, with deep regard, to

the one who more than any other has been instrumental in achieving the being and the well-being of the Liverpool Board of Biblical Studies ; and perhaps a word about that movement will not be out of place. In an age when ecclesiastical feeling runs high on all sides, it is a cause for very real thankfulness that it should be found possible for men of every shade of opinion in the Church of England and in the Free Churches to meet together on the common ground of serious study, and organize systematic teaching on subjects which might well be regarded as delicate and contentious. It is, further, indicative of the general spirit prevailing on the Board that this particular course, of all others, should have been entrusted to two Nonconformist ministers ; and they are glad of the opportunity thereby afforded them of participating in a work so fraught with promise and with healing influence.

W. FIDDIAN MOULTON.

W. T. WHITLEY.

PRESTON, *June* 1910.

CONTENTS

LECTURE	PAGE
I (M) THE INTERNATIONAL CHURCH AND NATIONAL CHURCHES . . .	11
II (M) THE COUNTER-REFORMATION . . .	43
III (W) CALVIN AND HIS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE	69
IV (W) THE INDEPENDENT ^{city} IDEA AS ELABORATED IN ENGLAND	99
V (W) PURITANISM ON THE FIELD OF ACTION	133
VI (W) UNBELIEF AND APOLOGETIC . . .	163
VII (M) THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL . . .	195
VIII (M) THE OXFORD MOVEMENT . . .	227
IX (M) THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX . . .	261
X (W) CHRISTIANITY AS A MISSIONARY RELIGION	293
INDEX	317

I

NATIONAL CHURCHES AND THE
INTERNATIONAL CHURCH

- (i) Three aspects of the Reformation need to be distinguished—
(a) Spiritual, mainly concerned with doctrine and spiritual life—(b) Ecclesiastical, comprising questions of discipline and administration—(c) National, involving the relations of the papal court to princes and people, and also the rights of the laity. The fact that the three lines of revolt converged upon the papacy made the epoch so critical (pp. 11-15).
- (ii) The conflict in Germany between Papalism and religious reformation—*Cuius regio eius religio* a temporary working basis, but no final solution (pp. 15-23).
- (iii) The English Reformation—Divorce question and its bearing—The Prayer-books of Edward VI—Elizabeth and her attitude (pp. 23-39).

LECTURE I

NATIONAL CHURCHES AND THE INTERNATIONAL CHURCH

IN starting this course of lectures from the Reformation, it is important to emphasize the fact that the Reformation was much more than a religious revolt which became articulate in Luther. The century of the great awakening saw the awakening of the soul, as of the mind ; but it is probably not saying too much to assert that without the fostering spirit of the age the spirit of a Luther would have been impotent to change the face of things ecclesiastical. It was because, in God's providence, Luther came 'in the fullness of time' that he achieved so great a triumph.

There are several phases of the preparation for the great awakening which call for mention. The feudal system received rude shocks

from the invention of gunpowder, which placed knight and peasant on a level; from the Black Death, which by decimating labour, augmented its bargaining power; from the Wars of the Roses, which destroyed or paralysed the great feudal families. The invention of printing gave the thinker a voice with which to call upon the world at large. The discovery of the Cape of Good Hope and of America widened men's horizon, and, by fostering imagination, begat freedom of thought. The recovery of classical literature, aided by the sack of Constantinople (1453), gave the world new models and revived the knowledge of Greek. Well may Acton, in express terms, date the existence of the modern state from that epoch!

It stands to reason that Religion could not fail to be influenced by the new spirit of inquiry and enterprise. But directly we turn in that direction we find that there were forces peculiar to itself that made for an awakening, if not a revolution, in the sphere of religion. The later years of the Middle Ages had wit-

nessed a number of spiritual forces at work, not lying outside the Church altogether, but yet not placing the emphasis upon the Church. The mystical and quasi-mystical teachers of the period—and they were very numerous—acted as solvents of Catholicism, and as such were unconscious or conscious heralds of the Reformation. How far the great inarticulate mass of the population of Germany was prepared for Luther's message it is hard to gauge ; but the strong backing which he received, and the enormous demand for printed books and pamphlets—eighty per cent. of which were on the side of the Reformation, in spite of the censorship established at Worms in 1523—point to a powerful popular sentiment behind him.

In the second place there was the manifest and undisguised corruption of the Church. The need of reform had been admitted on all sides since the Council of Constance, and before ; but every one demanded that it should begin in his neighbour's establishment, and reform from within was found to be hopeless. Thus it was that the laity, who might not be able

to understand refinements of doctrine but could appreciate cleanness of life ; and who, while not over-scrupulous themselves, demanded that the teachers of religion should practise it, became more and more intolerant of the papal curia with its insatiable greed and its shameless vice. But they had no *locus standi*, and they were just awaking to the consciousness of the fact ; so much so that the Reformation has been truly described as the religious aspect of the advent of the middle class. The papacy, however, failed to realize this momentous change ; and it did not see the fact, so plain to statesmen, that the age of Anselm and of Becket was gone, never to return. The whole future of Europe and of the world would have been different had the papacy been willing to reform palpable and acknowledged abuses ; for the demand for doctrinal reform and restatement gathered most of its strength from the not unnatural inference that bad fruits pointed to bad roots. From this standpoint it is possible for many who regret the schism caused by the Reformation and whose emphasis is very far from Luther's, to admit

that the Reformation was the greatest factor in the preparation for modern liberty.

In the third place there cannot be separated from the advent of the middle classes the growth of national sentiment and aspirations. The papacy was incorrigibly Italian. It had its own dynastic interests to serve: and only too often these interests took precedence of the well-being of Christendom. The utter disregard of German complaints in the proceedings concerning Luther was not likely to improve matters. Patriotism reinforced humanism in the conflict with papal absolutism; and it is not without its significance that when Luther promulgated to the world his theses he did it in the German tongue. Later on we shall find England travelling by a similar road to the same end.

With the details of the Reformation we are not concerned in this course of lectures; but only with the paths by which Christendom, leaving the old régime—the one International Church—arrived at the new. The attitude of Rome towards the new movement was at first one of contemptuous indifference. To self-

satisfied, worldly Italian prelates it was 'a German brawl' and no more. But that attitude could not be long maintained in face of the facts; and the position was taken up that these matters in dispute belonged to the sphere of faith, and were therefore under the sole jurisdiction of the pope. This was hardly less impolitic, for the papacy was too isolated to be able to sustain the claim. The German princes were independent; and the Emperor Charles V, the official protector of the papacy, was so far alienated in his sympathies as to hint that the Sack of Rome might be a divine judgement! In short the papal court had forgotten that a new age had dawned; and that the claims of the Church would never again receive the unquestioning assent which characterized the ecclesiastical relations of the Middle Ages.

Time was when the attitude of secular powers, imperial and princely, would have been regarded as either a negligible quantity or a foregone conclusion—as when an emperor knelt in the snow at Canossa to implore the pope's forgiveness—but that was no longer

the disposition of kings and princes. Napoleon once hazarded the opinion that had Charles V championed the cause of Luther the imperial authority would have become absolutely omnipotent. The *idea* is not so unthinkable as at first it may appear to be. Charles was strongly committed to the policy of ecclesiastical reform; and although not German in his sympathies, still less was he Italian: and his official headship of Germany made him determined that its liberties should not be impaired—unless it might be in the interests of his own dynasty. But Napoleon was wrong; and his error arose from his failure to realize the strength of national sentiment against the undue aggressiveness of either pope or emperor. All Charles's attempts to establish centralized imperial government in Germany broke down under the influence of centrifugal forces which had their origin far back in history. The princes were the determining factor in the German Reformation.

Now, when this fact is placed side by side with Luther's strong bias towards autocracy

in religion it is obvious at once that the Lutheran movement was bound to work out in the end in the establishment of national Churches. It is a wholly erroneous reading of history which represents the Lutheran reformation as a superb struggle for religious liberty. Luther had far too much horror of revolt and disorder, far too much servile admiration for princes to be the champion of liberty: and the pernicious doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings owes much to the Lutheran advocacy. On the other hand the logical outcome of Zwinglianism was to rest legitimate monarchy upon a foundation of submission to ecclesiastical authority: though it must be admitted that, in practice, Bucer and Melanchthon, Luther and the pope, all alike at one time or other took their stand upon absolutism, and doubted the right of their opponents to live at all!

Nevertheless, the Reformation ultimately made for liberty in religion, and it did so by virtue of its emphasis upon the prerogatives of the individual soul. Luther was unconsciously false to the logical demands of his own central

doctrine, and he was influenced by expediency in his reliance upon the princes. But his main interests were spiritual, and the spiritual power which was generated at the Reformation outlived the expedients devised to safeguard it. It must further be remembered that Luther's horror of revolt led him into such ruthless denunciation of the peasant insurrectionists that he hopelessly alienated them, and was thereby driven more for assistance to the princes; with the inevitable result that he was compelled to condone much that was offensive to him, of which the bigamous relations of Philip of Hesse may be taken as typical.

In the final settlement three dates stand out from all the rest. In 1525 the Diet of Spires adopted the proposal that each prince should so act as he could answer for his conduct to God and the emperor. Another Diet of Spires in 1529 assumed the controlling force of the prince in his own territory; but while demanding toleration for Roman Catholics in 'Reformed' States, it strove to forbid the further spread of the new teaching into

states where it was as yet not established ; and thereby evoked from the 'Reformed' princes the 'Protest' which has given a badge to half the Christian world. Finally, after thirty years of conflict and many attempts at pacification, the Peace of Augsburg (1555) officially recognized Protestantism on a territorial basis. The very *personnel* of this Diet witnessed to the hopelessness of the conflict. None of the Electors and only two of the ecclesiastical princes were present, while the Protestant princes gathered in an assembly of their own, and agreed to stand by the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which, while affirming their oneness with the main body of mediaeval theology as embodied in Augustine, repudiated the sacrificial character of the mass, auricular confession, monastic vows, clerical celibacy and various ecclesiastical abuses. Nevertheless, there was a real desire for peace ; and ultimately it was decided (i) that the Lutheran religion should be legalized within the empire, and that Lutheran princes should enjoy full security for the practice of their religion, no provision being made for non-Lutheran

Churches : (ii) that future changes should be settled upon the principle *cuius regio eius religio*, freedom being conceded to dissidents to emigrate. Two matters of importance were left unsettled. (i) Rome demanded that an ecclesiastical prince should forfeit lands and dignities on abandoning his faith. The Protestants refused to be bound by this. (ii) Protestants demanded toleration in territory of Roman princes. This was not embodied in the document, but the Emperor Ferdinand promised that it should be carried out. The uncertainty upon these crucial points lay at the root of the disaffection which eventually found expression in the Thirty Years' War.

Lord Acton sums up the acquisitions of the Peace of Augsburg in a passage which is full of wisdom, not unmixed with satire and contempt. 'There was to be no mutual persecution, taking persecution to mean the penalty of death. No subject on either side could be deprived of life or property, could be tortured or imprisoned, or even banished if there were numbers, for that would be ruinous to the State. Governments were

obliged to oppress him wisely, depriving him of church and school, of preacher and schoolmaster, and by those nameless acts with which the rich used to coerce the poor in the good old days, and which, under the name of influence, were not considered altogether infamous by Englishmen in the last generation. When people had been deprived of their pastors the children were sent to Catholic schools. Fervent preachers came among them—Jesuits, or, it might be, Capuchins—widely different in morality, in earnestness, education, and eloquence from the parish clergy whose deficiencies gave such succour to Luther. Therefore it was by honest conviction, as well as by calculated but not illegal coercion, that the Reformation was driven back, and Protestants who had been almost the nation became no more than a bare majority.’ But unquestionably a new era had been inaugurated, if only by the fact that the pope could no longer enforce the penalties of excommunication upon Protestants merely because they were such. The Peace of Augsburg marks the first stage of the journey to toleration and complete religious

freedom. But it was more than that; for it was a first stage which rendered the succeeding stages absolutely inevitable sooner or later. *Cuius regio eius religio* may be a welcome shelter, but it is no home.

The nature of the reforming tendencies in Germany has been dealt with somewhat in detail because it was there that the battle was fought out most fiercely, and on the clearest issues. The fate of those tendencies in France belongs to Calvin's sphere of influence (Lecture III); so we turn to England, the only other sphere which can be dealt with at all fully within the limits of this course. The relations between England and Rome had varied greatly according to the disposition and strength of the leaders at either end. Hildebrand and William I were fairly well matched, and neither could lord it over the other; but Innocent III and John were a very different pair; and when the overbearing power of the papacy was used against a weak monarch he went under, until those happier times when national representation became a reality and a safeguard. With the increasing depravity

of the Court of Rome and the development of self-government the revolt against papal usurpations became more aggressive, and two Statutes of Provisors and one of Praemunire in the second half of the fourteenth century are indicative of the national temper. Alongside of this was the growing sense that religion is far more than mere allegiance to a system—and a system discredited in many respects. Lollardism, mysticism, humanism: all these made their contributions towards preparing the ground for new teaching and new light.

There is a marked difference between the channels by which the Reformation reached Germany on the one hand and England on the other. The German movement originated in the sphere of religion, and later became mixed up in secular politics; the English movement grew out of a personal revolt on an administrative issue, and only became religious—in any deep and worthy sense—in spite of those who had raised the issue. The part played by Henry VIII in the English Reformation is one of the curiosities of history; but it is also a notable example of the over-ruling power of

Providence. The divorce proceedings are an integral part of that movement, and it cannot be grasped without account being taken of them. There is an element of doubt—for the testimony is conflicting—as to whether the marriage between Prince Arthur and Catherine of Aragon was ever consummated, for he died a few months after the wedding at about eighteen years of age. To Campeggio, under confession twenty years later, Catherine declared that her first marriage had never been consummated, and we have no right to disbelieve her testimony, even though the release from the obligation of secrecy which she gave to her confessor brings her testimony down into the muddy waters of controversy. Probably it was this element of doubt that caused the pope, under pressure from both Ferdinand of Spain and Henry VII of England, to grant a dispensation allowing Prince Henry to marry Catherine—so irregular a proceeding from the standpoint of canonical law that the pope had grave doubts as to his competency in the matter.

It is usual to represent the ‘conscientious

scruples' of Henry VIII with regard to his marriage as being merely a pretence with which to cover up his lustful designs on Anne Boleyn. But in justice to him we must remember that the evidence furnished by the *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII* proves that both he and Catherine at the time of their marriage had their misgivings as to whether they were not guilty of a mortal sin; and when the first four children of their marriage lived only for a few days, or did not live at all, those misgivings were naturally deepened. When in 1525 there was no male heir, national policy and the dread of a female succession reinforced superstitious fears and lustful desires, and constituted an overwhelming and controlling force working for release. Hence came the demand that the pope should release him from the intolerable situation, a situation in which fear of consequences played a large part, as it often does in the lives of men who are dead to spiritual influence. But if lofty moral considerations had no great part in Henry's line of conduct, the same must be admitted concerning Pope

Clement VII, for he it was who suggested bigamy as Henry's best way out of the difficulty, deeming it a less severe strain upon his prerogative to condone the marriage with Anne Boleyn while Catherine was still his wife, both legally and canonically, than to annul the original contract! It affords a striking illustration of how the papacy was demoralized and hampered by its dynastic interests, and dared not to travel along the straightest path because, having chosen to play the prince, it became involved in the alliances and enmities of princes.

The long-drawn-out reluctance of Clement to yield to his request, ending in a point-blank refusal, led Henry to raise the whole question of the pope's authority in England. If Pope Julius had no right to grant the dispensation, and Pope Clement no will or power to revoke that dispensation, then it remained for Henry to simply disavow the authority of the pope altogether, to act upon his own initiative, and to take the freedom which the pope refused to give. But it will be clear at once how far-reaching was such a

determination. It meant reversing all the traditions of the past in the sphere of ecclesiastical authority. However restricted had been the pope's power of interference in the ordinary civil life of England, his authority was never disputed in the things of religion : and the more he refrained from asserting himself outside his proper sphere the more readily was he recognized as the Vicar of Christ. But Henry's action gave the death-blow both to the one and the other. In 1532 the payment of first-fruits, generally known as annates, was conditionally discontinued ; and two years later the enactment was made absolute in answer to the pope's threat of excommunication if Anne Boleyn was not put away within ten days. In the same year took place what is called the Submission of the Clergy, according to which Convocation was made subject to the king. Three years previously the clergy of the province of Canterbury had been fined £100,000 for having recognized the legatine authority of Wolsey ; and had been compelled to acknowledge the king as ' their singular protector (!) and only supreme lord ; and as

far as that is permitted by the law of Christ the supreme head of the Church and of the clergy.' Now they were forced to promise that no new canons should be made without the king's licence and ratification; and that all previous canons should be submitted to a committee of thirty-two members, chosen by the king, half from the two Houses of Parliament, half from the ranks of the clergy. The changed attitude to the See of Rome is very soon evident from the language of the Statute Book. The Conditional Restraint of Annates (1532) speaks of 'Our said Holy Father the Pope'; the Absolute Restraint two years later refers to 'the said Bishop of Rome, otherwise called the pope'; while Henry, who had a vocabulary of his own, rich and tasty, inveighed against 'that most persistent idol, enemy of all truth, and usurpator of princes, the Bishop of Rome,' 'that cankered and venomous serpent Paul Bishop of Rome.'

The breach was wide, and during Henry's lifetime, irrevocable; and, from the standpoint of religious reformation, it was a clear gain that the great obstacle to reformed doctrines

and practice was removed. Let no one, however, think of Henry VIII as a religious reformer. His action was mainly selfish in its motive, and there is no reason to believe that he had any sympathy with the Protestant conception of the gospel. There were, however, personal and political reasons which made it advisable to keep on good terms with the League of Schmalkald; and these find documentary expression in the promulgation of the Ten Articles, which mark a decided advance towards removal of superstition without unduly disturbing the faith of the people. The sacraments of Baptism, of the Eucharist and of Penance were recognized, but not the rest of the Roman sacraments; and amendment of life was laid down as a necessary element of penance—a beautiful touch as coming from such a quarter! Moreover, several practices, such as the invocation of the Virgin and the saints, were admitted to be good and laudable, but with a caution. More important, however, than the Articles were the ‘Injunctions’ which accompanied them, for amongst them was the provision made for supplying the people with

the Scriptures in the vernacular by means of a chained Bible in every church. How little Henry sided with Protestantism in matters of doctrine is shown by the drastic Statute of Six Articles (1539), promulgated as a first step towards breaking with the League. The 'king's most excellent majesty' put it forth as an Act 'abolishing Diversity of Opinion'; but in that it endorsed and enforced under penalty the acceptance of transubstantiation and celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, communion in one kind, auricular confession and private masses, it was not likely to promote that ideal and impossible end. A German ambassador wrote home saying that 'the king has become Lutheran so far that, because the pope has refused to sanction his divorce, he has ordered, on penalty of death, that every one shall believe and preach that not the pope but himself is the head of the universal Church. All other papistry, monasteries, mass, indulgences and intercessions for the dead are pertinaciously adhered to.' Except so far as monasteries are concerned, the estimate is a fairly true one; but, although for a time the

road from Rome to Canterbury lay by way of Windsor, unknown to himself Henry had made possible, if not inevitable, a religious revolution the effects of which were to last for ever.

It is a significant fact that the council nominated by Henry within five weeks of his death, to govern in the name of his young son Edward, was largely composed of those who were committed to the principles of the Reformation; and the early measures taken by the Council were most plain in their purpose. (i) Injunctions were issued to the clergy bidding them, among other things, to preach against 'the Bishop of Rome's usurped power and jurisdiction.' (ii) Commissioners were sent out in the name of the king to ascertain the facts concerning the efficiency and character of the clergy. If the 'visitation' conducted by Hooper in the diocese of Gloucester, details of which have been published by Dr. James Gairdner, was typical, the spiritual condition of England must have been simply deplorable. (iii) Homilies, written in part by Cranmer, were put forth to eke out the poverty

of preaching. (iv) Parliament annulled the repressive legislation of Henry's later years.

But more important, perhaps, than anything else was the compilation of a new service-book—the First Prayer-book of Edward VI, which formed the basis for the revisions of 1552 and 1559. Details of difference between the two books put forward under the authority of Edward VI must not detain us here except in so far as they illustrate the varying attitude of the State towards certain crucial matters of religious belief and practice. (i) Mr. Leighton Pullan affirms that the First Prayer-book of Edward VI gave as explicit teaching concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice as the Sarum canon of the Mass; and even if this is somewhat of an over-statement, it is unquestionable that 'the Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass' points to a desire to be as inoffensive as possible, though it is improbable that any Roman service-book would use such moderating language. From the Second Prayer-book the reference to the Mass disappears, as do many other distinctly Roman features; and

the 'altar' gives place to the 'table.' (ii) The 'words of delivery' to which we are accustomed are the result of the fusion, in 1559, of the language of the two preceding books, most skilfully and with true spiritual insight combining the sacrificial and the commemorative conceptions. (iii) What is known as the Black Rubric was inserted in 1552. It was an order in Council interpreting the rubric on kneeling at the Communion; and affirmed that 'no adoration is done or ought to be done, either to the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood.' This was omitted in 1559; but the position is safeguarded by Article 28.

On the accession of Mary the leaders of the reforming party suffered under the very instruments which they themselves had forged: and on November 30, 1554, the two Houses of Parliament besought Cardinal Pole, the legate, 'that they might receive absolution and be received into the body of the Holy Catholic Church, under the pope, the supreme head thereof.' How far the people as a whole were touched

by the rapid reversals of the last thirty years it is impossible to say. The nobles were at heart loyal to the new faith, which had given them abbey lands! The clergy were for the most part averse to a breach with the old régime, but had not probably the convictions, based upon earnest searching after truth, which alone can make men strong against the seductions of expediency; and they capitulated to the State in the end. It was among the mass of the people that the principles of the Reformation had gained the strongest hold; and that was due on the one hand to the abuses of Romanism, and on the other to the permeating influence of the vernacular Scriptures; and the bias of the English people has been pronouncedly anti-Roman from that day to this. But had Mary's reign been long, or Elizabeth's short, it is difficult to estimate what turn things would have taken; and Protestants may be pardoned for seeing the hand of Providence in the short duration of Mary's rule, and the abnormally long reign of one of Elizabeth's peculiar temperament.

The personal views of Elizabeth upon religious

questions are not easy to ascertain, or rather to focus ; for there are so many component parts, not always quite congruous with each other. It is probably doing her no injustice to say that she was neither devout nor theologically-minded, but was essentially an opportunist. She was averse to a 'bare' religion ; but was equally averse to excessive ceremonial, especially when likely to cause trouble. She was an intensely 'national' sovereign, determined to allow no interference from either pope or prince, and devoting all her diplomacy to that end. Such a character falls far short of the highest standard, but no other type could have been quite so efficient in this peculiar and critical epoch of transition.

That the Church was still Roman in its leanings is shown by the fact that the Lower House of Convocation declared for the Mass, for transubstantiation, and for the papal supremacy in February 1559. And yet fewer than 2,000 out of 9,400 clergy at the highest computation refused in the end to use the new Prayer-book ; and Parliament, under pressure, declared Elizabeth to be 'supreme governor of

the realm as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things as in temporal.' It was also ordained that no foreign prelate or prince had any ecclesiastical or spiritual authority in her dominions. The Act of Uniformity (April 1559) confined lawful public worship to the Book of Common Prayer which was an amended form of that of Edward VI; and opposition, especially amongst the well-to-do, was ground down by fines, or conciliated by compromise. Conformity was all that the Queen demanded, and that was more at the bidding of political instinct than any religious conviction. This has given to the English Reformation an Erastian complexion which is apt to deceive. Underneath the ecclesiastical settlement there was a body of deep religious conviction and piety which gave to the new system a life and validity which otherwise it could never have acquired. Of course on either side of the Elizabethan Church there were those who dissented. On the one hand, there were those Catholics whom no compromise would bring within the State Church, and who remained in a condition of more or less pronounced

hostility. It is, however, only fair to recognize that English Roman Catholics, as a whole, during the reign of Elizabeth, were not disloyal citizens by any means, and that there is much reason for believing that Lord Howard of Effingham, who commanded the English fleet against the Armada, was a Roman Catholic. Elizabeth herself had no wish to harry those who gave no trouble; and much was winked at. Then, on the other hand, there were those who viewed the Reformation as an arrested growth, and deplored the degree to which elements of the old system survived in the new. To this type of variation Elizabeth was less than just. She bore more heavily upon them because she could not understand them, and they seemed to her to be troublesome cranks. Conformity is certainly not an ideal, a goal: neither is it worthless or immoral. It was probably the best half-way house that could be put up at that time, for the age of toleration was not yet; and in the meantime nonconformists, whether Roman or Protestant, had to suffer.

‘Tantum valet quantum ad corrigendum,

purgandum, sanctificandum hominem confert,' says Döllinger on Dogma: which, being interpreted, comes to this—that the value of dogma is in exact proportion to its power to effect man's sanctification. By this standard—which is little else than Christ's saying, 'a tree is known by its fruits'—and by this alone must be judged the dogmas of Rome and Wittenberg, Canterbury and Geneva.

II

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

- (i) Widespread recognition of the need for radical reformation of 'the Church in all its members'; no new demand—Cardinal Ximenes—Theatines—Charles V voiced German feeling in his insistence upon a Council to reform abuses, while the pope was only willing to call one to define dogma (pp. 43-47).
- (ii) The Council of Trent—a belated and only partially successful attempt to evade reform and harden doctrinal definition—conflicting estimates of Sarpi and Pallavicini—Main lines of discussion—Effect upon (a) the Church; (b) Protestantism (pp. 47-57).
- (iii) The Society of Jesus—Loyola—Institution of the Order—Its political interference (pp. 57-61).
- (iv) The Inquisition and the Index—The organization of intolerance and intellectual repression (pp. 61-66).

LECTURE II

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

AMID all the worldliness of the Church and the doctrinal revolts of the Protestants there were those who were as averse to the one as they were to the other. It is to these forces, making for reform from within, that we now turn; forces so potent in the end that, as Macaulay truly expresses it, 'Rome having lost a large part of Europe not only ceased to lose but actually regained nearly half of what she had lost.'

The influence of the Emperor Charles V may be counted among the forces which were favourable to reform; though it is not a great injustice to him to say that he had not the power to understand a work of real spiritual reformation. His bias was decidedly anti-Italian, and he recognized the scandalous

abuses of which the papal court was so prolific ; but he was too Spanish and too much of a Hapsburg to work harmoniously with German princes ; and that is why, even after the battle of Mühlberg, he was unable to get his own way at the Diet of Augsburg in 1547. A general Council on German soil was his panacea for all evils, and to the achievement of that end he devoted his diplomacy.

But the sixteenth century witnessed many manifestations of genuine reforming spirit. In Spain, for instance, under Cardinal Ximenes there was a resolute attempt to set the house of the Church in order ; and the attempt was successful up to a certain point. But in the end it failed because it did not grow naturally out of the aspirations of the people. It is noticeable that no reforming movement of lasting effect grew on southern soil : the ease-loving southerner was quite willing to leave things as they were. Heroism is not often begotten under a hot sun. In Italy several new orders were founded during the first half of the sixteenth century, of which the Capuchins—a kind of reformed Franciscans—and the

Theatines were the most important. The latter were quasi-monastic in their life, combining with it duties of a parochial kind. Caraffa, Contarini, Sadoletto and Pole had all been associated with the religious movement centring in the Oratory of the Divine Love in the Church of St. Sylvester; and their almost simultaneous elevation to the sacred college seemed to augur well for an age of genuine religious reform. Contarini seems to have accepted the doctrine of justification by faith; and Pole wrote with enthusiasm concerning it as a doctrine long forgotten by the Church, but now restored to its rightful prominence by Contarini. Whether the terms used meant to them the same as they meant to Protestant writers and champions is somewhat doubtful: but it is unquestionably true that there was a stage in the doctrinal conflict when the best men on both sides seemed to come surprisingly near each other; and that when that moment had once passed it never returned, and any such approximation is as far off to-day as ever it has been.

The Council of Ratisbon in 1541 marks the

final parting of the ways. There was much that pointed to an amicable solution of current difficulties. The pope was well-disposed; the emperor was desirous of unity, especially in face of the Turk on the Eastern frontier; and while on one side Contarini's pacific influence counted for much, on the other Bucer and Melancthon were willing to co-operate to the same end. It must be borne in mind that the definite codification of doctrine had not gone so far then as it has done since; and re-statement was therefore more possible than it would otherwise have been. But the hopelessness of a peaceful issue became manifest when the papal authority and the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist came under consideration. The conceptions held by the opposing parties were too antithetic to be reconcileable: and it is certain that the pope, the college of cardinals, and the Church at large would not have conceded as much as Contarini was willing to concede in the interests of peace. At all events this last attempt at pacification failed. Contarini retired to the governorship of Bologna, and died in the following year;

while Caraffa (shortly to become Pope Paul IV) and Pole expiated their sin of liberalism by throwing all their energies into repression. Henceforth the forces making for reaction had it all their own way in the Church; and the sequel takes the form not only of a counter-reformation but a counter-renaissance also. The ideals of Erasmus were as absolutely proscribed as those of Luther, so far as comprehension was concerned. And it is just this fact which has accentuated the chasm between Protestantism and Romanism. The Counter-Reformation penalized humanity in the name and in the supposed interests of faith; and the realization of that fact by many within the Church is at the bottom of the disposition known as modernism. But it is centuries overdue.

Three elements in the Counter-Reformation call for our attention; viz. the Council of Trent, the Society of Jesus, and the Inquisition. Councils are somewhat apt to disappoint those who clamour for them. Just as the Vatican Council of our own times was eagerly awaited as the hope of the reforming party, and in the

end riveted more tightly than ever the bonds of ultramontaniam : so the Council of Trent, which Acton accuses of having 'impressed on the Church the stamp of an intolerant age, and perpetuated by its decrees the spirit of an austere immorality,' was extorted from an unwilling pope by an emperor who demanded the reform of ecclesiastical abuses. It is hardly surprising that the pope should have viewed a council with disfavour, when we remember how great a vested interest in such abuses was held by pope and cardinals ; and it is without any sense of astonishment that we learn from Pallavicini, the official apologist for the pope and the council, that when the idea of summoning a general council was first seriously put forward there was forthwith a decided fall in the prices obtainable for offices at the papal court. But even among the powers which favoured reform there were too many divergent interests to make any substantial amendment possible. Spain, for instance, favoured reform so far as ecclesiastical abuses were concerned ; but would not allow doctrine or the papal authority to be touched. France was not

altogether wishful that German differences should be healed, and was not at all disposed to let the emperor obtain all he wished to get by posing as the protector of the papacy. The interaction of religious, political, and personal interests is an integral factor in the history of the period: and on one occasion it presents us with the curious spectacle of the pope siding with Protestants against the emperor!

The two original authorities for the Council of Trent are Paolo Sarpi and Pallavicini, of whom Ranke gives a critical examination in the third volume of his *History of the Popes*. Sarpi shows a strong reforming bias. He hated the court of Rome, and was hostile to the council because it was so papal. Writing about the year 1630 he built his history upon first-class documents, mostly Venetian: and it is to his credit that he never falsifies his authorities, though it must be admitted that he does not succeed in throwing aside his natural bias, and he is not lacking in venom. 'The legate,' he tells us, for instance, 'summoned the assembly and gave his opinion first: for the Holy Spirit,

who is wont to move the legates in accordance with the wishes of the pope, and the bishops in accordance with those of the legates, inspired them on this occasion in His usual manner.' Needless to say, Sarpi is on the Index.

Pallavicini, writing about twenty years later, was a Jesuit, working on materials collected by another Jesuit: and he is as much a champion of the papacy as Sarpi is its critic. This very fact gave him access to documents which Sarpi never saw: but this advantage is more than counterbalanced by his proneness to suppress inconvenient material, instances of which are cited in detail by Ranke. 'Would any one,' says Ranke, 'now undertake a new history of the Council of Trent he must begin anew from the very commencement. He must collect the several negotiations, and the discussions of the different congregations, of which very little that is authentic has been made known; he must also procure the dispatches of one or other of the ambassadors who were present. Then only could he obtain a complete view

of his subject, or be in a condition to examine the two antagonistic writers who have already attempted this history. But this is an undertaking that will never be entered on, since those who could certainly do it have no wish to see it done, and will therefore not make the attempt: and those who might desire to accomplish it do not possess the means.'

The council took a long time in getting to work. There were many bickerings as to its location, for each party wished to have it under their own influence. The pope insisted that it should sit in Italy; but the emperor, realizing that it would in no sense be a free council if that were the case, demanded that it should sit in Germany. Eventually Trent was fixed upon as a compromise, lying as it did within the imperial dominions, and yet in reality within the papal sphere of influence. There was similar disagreement as to purpose and policy; for while the pope looked on the council solely as a means of defining and enforcing dogma, the emperor was bent on ecclesiastical reform. Eventually it was decided that two commissions, on Faith and

Reform, should sit simultaneously; and that the two subjects should be brought alternately before the council. This was done in the teeth of the papal legates, who, however, ultimately accepted it lest a worse thing should come upon them.

Summoned for November 1542, the council transacted its first business in 1545. It sat till March 1547 at Trent: it was then transferred by the pope—ostensibly on the ground of epidemic—to Bologna in April, and sat there till June. From May 1551 to April 1552 it sat at Trent: and it reassembled there in January 1562 and sat till December 1563. Viewed as a whole, it is a council which utterly fails to command respect. ‘What madness,’ cried Paul IV in an outburst of candour, ‘to have sent threescore bishops from amongst the least capable to a small city among the mountains there to decide so many things!’ It was in no sense œcumenical: and several times appeals were sent to the pope to provide further supplies of Italian bishops to swamp the opposition. The council was opened with a fervent sermon from an Italian bishop who

assured the assembled fathers that to open the doors of the council was to open the doors of heaven, whence would descend the living water so as to fill the earth with the knowledge of the Lord. He exhorted them to open their hearts as dry ground to receive the living water, and to amend their lives : and he added that even if their lives remained always vicious and corrupt the Holy Spirit would not fail to open their lips, like those of Caiaphas and Balaam ; lest, if the council erred, the world might fall with it into error. It was very soon apparent that there were several cross-currents in the council, partly national, partly doctrinal. The Spanish bishops, eager for reform and championing episcopal rights as against papal absolutism, were inflexible in their opposition to clerical marriage and the concession of the cup to the laity. The French and the German bishops, on the other hand, favoured both concessions ; while the Italian bishops fought against Spanish, French, and German alike.

The operations of the council fall into four stages. The matter for discussion was first

prepared by experts, and at this stage the Jesuit influence was paramount: and Lainez, who succeeded Loyola as general of the order, probably exercised more influence than any other single member of the council. After the experts had done their work it was discussed by the separate congregations; then it went before the full assembly; after which the decrees of the council were promulgated. The scenes were anything but placid. No amount of 'management' from Rome succeeded in achieving unanimity, and feeling at times ran very high. The Cardinal Archbishop of Trent, Madruzzo, took an inconveniently independent line, and when confronted on one occasion with a papal bull, he boldly declared that popes had erred. Another bishop maintained that the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was unknown to the early Church; while an archbishop gave it as his opinion that '*illustrissimi cardinales egent illustrissima reformatione*'—which was probably only too true. When such a temperature had been generated it is perhaps not surprising to hear that two bishops, Neapolitan and Greek,

differed over justification by faith with such vehemence that works followed, and the beard of the latter came out in handfuls.

The matters of doctrine which came under discussion were mainly justification by faith, the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, the penitential system, and indulgences; and the positions taken up were reactionary to the last degree, and enforced by anathemas. On the practical side by far the most heated and protracted debates centred in the question whether the residence of bishops was *jure divino* or *lege ecclesiastica*. If it was the former, then the pope could not give dispensations to cardinals to live at a distance from sees whose revenues they enjoyed—a crying scandal of the age both in respect of papal greed and diocesan impoverishment. The Spanish bishops fought strongly throughout for episcopal rights as against papal absolutism, but they were in a minority in face of the obedient delegates of the pope. Ultimately the legates, acting on the instructions of Pius IV, put forward a decree on residence without any reference to divine obligation, imposing

penalties for non-residence 'unless for lawful reasons.' This qualification, together with the oft-repeated '*salva semper in omnibus sedis apostolicae auctoritate*,' rendered the decree absolutely nugatory.

In its later sessions the position of the council had altered, greatly to the advantage of the pope. There was no longer an imperious Charles V to dominate the situation, neither were there Protestants to be conciliated if possible; for that was now out of the question. Consequently the policy of repression was more vigorously applied. When each new bishop arrived at the council the papal agent consulted with the legate as to whether he should receive his expenses: and a few turns of the financial screw exercised a wondrous effect in the direction of clear theology and sound religion! Borromeo, who was by that time the papal secretary, wrote to the legates to the effect that the increase of the papal power over the council, and its speedy dissolution must be their main objects of endeavour. The Emperor Ferdinand and the Cardinal of Lorraine were won over to the

reactionary side, which meant the end of all effective resistance; and when Pope Sixtus V twenty-five years later appointed a congregation of the Council of Trent for the purpose of interpreting the decrees, the victory of reaction was complete.

The second formative influence in the period of the Counter-Reformation was that of the Society of Jesus: and, indeed, in its later years the Council of Trent derived all its vitality from the conviction and enthusiasm contributed by the new order. The story of Ignatius Loyola—the story of a military career interrupted by sickness and transfigured by divine grace—is too familiar to call for repetition. Loyola experienced spiritual agonies very much akin to those of Luther; but under the influence partly of temperament, partly of training, they came out of the trials on different sides. Luther, under the influence of the practicality natural to his class, and guided by St. Paul, found anchorage in justification by faith. Loyola, trained in an atmosphere of Spanish chivalry and military training, and guided by mediaeval penitential

systems, found peace in exaggerated self-abnegation and obedience.

The Society of Jesus originated in a company of kindred spirits—nine in number—who met together in a Paris church one day in 1534 for religious exercises and meditation; nine knights-errant of the Catholic religion who were destined to affect, for good or evil, the whole future of Christendom. The training of the band was along the lines of the *Spiritual Exercises*, the authorship of which is assigned with a fair degree of certainty to Loyola; and it is also noteworthy that the *Imitatio*, which was held in high esteem amongst them and was prescribed for neophytes, is referred to as the work of Gerson, the great champion of religious reform in France in the pre-reformation period. The members were subjected to a drastic course of discipline until mind and body alike were absolutely at the command of the general, as representing religion. ‘If anything which appears to our eyes to be white is defined by the Catholic Church to be black, we must forthwith declare that it is black.’¹

¹ *Spiritual Exercises*, Rule 13,

In a series of Three Declarations appended to the *Constitutions* two years after the death of Loyola we read: 'Obedience as to *execution* is yielded when the thing bidden is done: as to the *will* when he who obeys wishes the same thing as he who commands: as to the *intellect* when he thinks as does his superior, and esteems as well ordered that which is ordered. And that obedience is imperfect in which, beyond external execution, there is not this consent of the will and judgement between him who commands and him who obeys.' Thus the man tended more and more to be lost in the society; although with the development of the society and the accession of men of marked ability the suppression of individuality became less and less possible and the subjection to authority far less uniform. This is not the occasion for pronouncing upon the spiritual validity, or otherwise, of the ideals of Loyola. 'Show me, O Lord,' he cried, 'where I can find Thee. I will follow Thee like a dog if I only learn the way of salvation.' It is impossible to resist the sincerity and fervour of his religious aspirations, in an age that was

far from being pious : but it is possible to doubt whether the true *imitatio Christi* is to be found in the ruthless suppression of individuality and the cultivation of a dog-like submission.

The public history of the order commences with the Bull *Regimini militantis Ecclesiae* (Sept. 1540). The number of the 'professed' was limited to forty : but that restriction was shortly afterwards removed. There was opposition from many sides. Ignatius Loyola tells us that he was himself eight times accused of heresy, probably on the ground of a mysticism which was beyond the comprehension of materialistic ecclesiastics : and officialism is always afraid of an enthusiasm which may carry devotees outside the control of legally constituted authorities. But the most valid objection was on the score of its creating an *imperium in imperio*, the society being under the control of its own general, acting through provincials. It was feared, moreover—and with reason, as the events showed—that they would involve the Church in grave complications by interfering in the domestic affairs of the state, and by political machinations bring religion into disre-

pute. It is true that such meddling in political affairs was contrary to the express rules of the order; but with the amazing spread of the society over the face of the world it became increasingly hard to enforce such non-interference. In England, for instance, a Government may be pardoned for its inability to distinguish between the political plottings of Parsons and the religious propagandism of Campion. In spite of the rules of his own society, Parsons, both during the reign of Elizabeth and after the death of 'that miserable woman,' as he called her, consistently plotted in the interests of a Spanish succession. It was this disposition which led to the banishment of the Jesuits from so many European states and to the ultimate suppression of the society. But, for all that, they were a power which counted for much at the time when the fortunes of the Church were at their lowest, and their power was largely due to the general desire within the Roman communion for clean and fervid religion, even if it must be narrow withal.

The third factor in the Counter-Reformation, the Inquisition and the Index, cannot be

viewed apart from the other factors, of which they are the expression and the agents. The Inquisition was no new institution. In Spain it had long been vigorous: and under the first four Inquisitors-General eighteen thousand persons had been burned and two hundred thousand sentenced to penalties other than of death, in a period of forty-three years. The Holy Office was allowed to frame its own rules, and then the State lent its powers for the enforcement of them. It was the logical outcome of the mediaeval theory of the Church and of that typical exposition of it, the Bull *Unam Sanctam*; but nothing could possibly be more antithetic to the new spirit of the age. Of its effectiveness, however, there could be no doubt; and in 1542 the congregation of the Holy Office was founded at Rome under the influence of Caraffa—once the associate of Contarini—and six cardinals were appointed Inquisitors-General. In Italy the Inquisition was never so aggressive as in Spain, possibly because there was less need for it; but in the Netherlands its history is an appalling record of duplicity and brutality. Under stress of

opposition Philip, in a dispatch dated July 31, 1566, consented to abolish the papal Inquisition, and grant toleration so far as was consistent with the maintenance of the Catholic faith, and also a general pardon for those whom the regent considered deserving. But the Spanish archives show that on August 9, in the presence of three witnesses, including the Duke of Alva, Philip signed a document declaring that the pardon had been wrung from him against his will ; and that he should not feel bound by it. Three days later he instructed his ambassador at Rome to represent to the pope that his abolition of the papal Inquisition in the Netherlands was a mere form of words, because it could not operate without the authority of the pope himself. 'As to toleration and pardon,' he added, 'I will lose all my states and a hundred lives if I had them rather than be the lord of heretics.' The story of this conflict is a disgraceful one, calculated to bring a sense of shame to any candid Catholic : but it must not detain us here. Is it not written for all time, with wondrous charm and passion, in the pages of Motley ?

The Inquisition worked along many lines, but nowhere more effectively than through the censorship of the press. Pope Paul IV put forth in 1557 an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* banning all writings by stated authors, including Erasmus. This was so universally recognized to be a bad piece of work that it was revised by the Council of Trent, and the Tridentine Index appeared in 1564. New works were to be examined by a commission, and catalogues of works condemned were from time to time to be put forth for the guidance of the reading of the faithful. The effectiveness of such a provision depended entirely upon local conditions; but viewed as a whole it unquestionably succeeded in repressing thought and stunting intellectual and moral growth. Sarpi with characteristic vigour calls it 'the finest secret which has ever been discovered for applying religion to the purpose of making men idiots.' Acton, with more self-restraint and therefore with far more effect, indicts it as 'an effort to give currency to a fabulous and fictitious picture of the progress and action of the Church.' But how active

were its agents is revealed by the fact that although sixty thousand copies of Flaminio's *Benefit of the Death of Christ* had been sold in a very short time, the book seemed, as Macaulay says, to have 'disappeared as hopelessly as the second decade of Livy': and it was only rediscovered quite recently in a Cambridge library. It is needless to enlarge upon the folly and danger of such attempts to regulate faith by organized repression of thought. It opened up a field for the black-mailer in a score of different ways. By its systematic interference with offensive texts, especially of history, it promoted a school of intellectual dishonesty. By safeguarding immunity from division at the cost of shutting out all light it created a fools' paradise. And when a pious champion of orthodoxy wrote to the pope that if the fathers at Trent were allowed to read Lutheran books they would become Lutherans themselves, he penned what was at the same time a homage, a confession, and an indictment.

But although the Council of Trent, the Society of Jesus, the Inquisition and the Index

all belong to the sphere of the reactionary, and strove by sheer weight of authority to crush independence of thought, nevertheless the period in which these forces took their rise was one of papal recovery and reformation. Did they effect the change or did they accompany it? The answers will differ according to the view taken of the inherent sanity and rectitude of the ideals represented by them. But it is impossible to be blind to the reality of the reformation within the Roman Church itself, dating from the middle of the sixteenth century. Under the stress of conflict with heresy the Church learned the lesson which had been pressed upon its attention in vain for at least three centuries; and it set its house in order. And in achieving that result Protestantism brought about what prophets and righteous men had longed to see, but died without the sight.

III
CALVIN AND HIS SPHERE OF
INFLUENCE

Luther provincial, Loyola an autocrat: Calvin a theologian and statesman.

- (i) Influence abroad. The *Institutio* a standard type of theology—Oligarchic government for a city—French development of a republican hierarchy, 'Presbyterian'—Dutch and Scotch adoption—Influence of the Genevan Bible and notes in Britain (pp. 69–80).
 - (ii) Influence in England. Calvin's doctrine accepted till Laud—Only Cartwright to lead, not Knox—Voluntary organization on Presbyterian lines forbidden by Elizabeth—High Commissions eject a third of the clergy—Repression by 1589 (pp. 80–88).
- James a Calvinist, no Presbyterian—Genevan Bible superseded—Parliamentary jealousy of bishops futile—Laud contrasts Calvinism and orthodoxy—Civil war—Charles resolutely refuses to establish Presbyterianism—The Long Parliament *versus* its Assembly of Divines—Hooker's criticism (pp. 88–95).

LECTURE III

CALVIN AND HIS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

THE upheaval of the Reformation brought to the surface three great ecclesiastics—Luther, Loyola, and Calvin. Luther was a German subject of the Holy Roman Empire, yet he gained little by his central position; he was a miner's son, yet broke with the commonalty and relied on a prince; he was a scholar, yet quarrelled with Erasmus and failed to enlist the Humanists; he was a friar, and brought most of his associates with him, yet at the cost of wrecking their organization. He brought to a focus many revolutionary feelings and many religious aspirations, but only those which shone within a narrow provincial sphere. There are no Lutherans but those who use a Gothic alphabet.

Loyola was a Spaniard, imbued with the

old chivalric ideals, with the feudal instinct of command. He carried these over to the realm of Church affairs, founding the military Company of Jesus, with its rigid vow of obedience, and all its energies bent to organize conservatism.

Calvin was a Frenchman; the first notable man to adopt the cause of Reformation who was not of German speech; of a race which has ever shown itself able to adapt and popularize great principles. He was a Humanist, able to enlist the best scholarship on his side. He had a legal training, and ranks with the great jurists who, of many races, have brought method and order and authority to the service of the Church; Tertullian and Augustine in earlier days, and Grotius in a later age, are in the same succession. He had a passion for order—orderly thought and orderly government. He was conservative, like all legists: not merely conservative of things as they were, in Loyola's fashion, but conservative of the latest apostolic model. For, like a true lawyer, he needed a text-book as his authority, whereon he might

comment; and this he found in the Bible. Acton has summed him up as marked by 'a genius for organization, a strong sense of social discipline, and a profound belief in ecclesiastical authority.'

I. HIS INFLUENCE ABROAD

1. *Origin and Nature*

His system of thought crystallized under two influences, revulsion from anabaptism, and patriotism; but it was essentially his own.

Between 1530 and 1535 the panic at militant anabaptism was at its height. To the apparent trend towards anarchy he opposed order; instead of the inner light he appealed to reason; if some Anabaptists taught that the soul at death lapsed into a sleep till the judgement day, he entered the lists with his first treatise, on *Psychopannychia*. Luther had let loose forces which no one could restrain or guide; the constructive efforts of Bugenhagen were of narrow range, the doctrinal *Common Places* of Melancthon were of tenuous texture; there was scope for a leader of thought

and of government. Luther had failed to enlist the sympathy of Charles V, but Cranmer was becoming the ecclesiastical adviser of Henry VIII; and Calvin made tentative overtures to Francis I, then persecuting the Protestants, in his rendering of Seneca's tract on *Clemency*, and in dedicating to his sovereign his own masterpiece, the *Institutio*. But his scheme was not destined to be trammelled by any royal patronage, and he elaborated it without further repulsion or attraction, applying to the Bible the resources of a mind richly stored with patristic learning, and sharpened by a legal course. The teaching that he poured forth was cast into an ancient mould, the Apostles' Creed. Thus he deliberately made the claim that he belonged to the Holy Catholic Church; no child of the Revolution was he, but one who built upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets; if some of the latest accretions were scraped away, yet he used what earlier doctors had fashioned, and laboured in their spirit.

His constructive work must be viewed on two sides, doctrine and government.

As to doctrine he followed in the wake of Luther and of Augustine, deeply appreciating the forensic side of the apostle Paul's teaching, though not so appreciative of the mystical side. His work here was epoch-making, and produced a type of doctrine which was all but unchallenged in Protestant circles for a century. Exaggerated though the statement may be that a thousand editions of his *Institution* appeared in his lifetime, the exaggeration testifies to the profound impression produced in all the Western nations. This book, and this alone, is to be put in the balances against the conclusions of Trent. At Heidelberg and Westminster, later theologians worked over his materials, but in his spirit. Hardly any dared strike out a completely new line, or succeeded in commanding attention if they ignored Calvin's doctrinal scheme.

The governmental scheme that accompanied was complicated with the demands of actual life, and we must distinguish his ideal, the Genevan compromise, and the French extension.

His aim was to ensure a truly Christian life of holiness ; if he discarded much of the current

method, it was only to recur to the style of the first century, and to lay stress on actual morality, rather than on the mere positive enactments which hedged the law. The means of grace on which he insisted were not absolutely new, but the emphasis was different. Teaching figured most prominently, catechetical for the young and lecture for the adult; so that a preaching ministry was essential. The congregational singing of metrical psalms became the well-known sign of a Calvinist gathering. But the Communion of the Lord's Supper was still central, only viewed in a new aspect, as a sacrament rather than a sacrifice, as an expression of fellowship to be repeated week by week, rather than a spectacle to be adored daily.

Purity of life in order to communion was jealously guarded, and early discipline was looked at longingly. Here, however, the ideals of the early Church conflicted with the practice of mediaeval towns. It was no new thing for guilds and courts to supervise the lives of members, and the Council of Geneva was not inclined to abdicate such a function and

entrust it wholly to ministers and elders. Calvin held and taught that the Church had a divine right and duty to keep her membership pure; but Luther had taught the divine right of kings to govern, and the Swiss magistracy brought about an amalgamation of powers.

The machinery that Calvin devised was for a single town, like the Greek city-church of the apostolic age. A company of believers, a bishop-pastor, a session of elders, a body of deacons: such were the simple elements with which he was content. The government was oligarchic, not democratic; and this type, congenial to a man from the upper middle class, and to the Swiss burgherhood, has characterized the management of a Presbyterian congregation ever since.

2. *Development under other auspices*

Calvin was responsible for the simple cell, but not for the compound organism. This had already been evolved by the Anabaptists at Augsburg as early as 1527, had been borrowed by Capito for Strassburg eight years later, and in 1559 was adopted by the French Calvinists.

It is essentially a hierarchy of committees, representing a congregation, a district group of such, a provincial group of districts, a national group of provinces. The French styled these consistories, colloquies, provincial synods, national synod; the Scotch style them kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synods, assembly; but French, Dutch, Scotch, English and Germans alike have tried the system of governing by articulated committees of ordained elders and ordained ministers.

When this pyramidal republican system was fully erected in France, it was taken as an affront to national feeling and a challenge to royal authority. Persecution had been sporadic before, it was now prosecuted vigorously. But the principle of non-resistance was never Calvinistic; only the Anabaptists had adopted it, while the mantle of Münster had passed to Lutherans and now to the French. For thirty years civil wars desolated France, till the accession of a Protestant, Henry of Navarre, brought about peace. He personally thought Paris worth a mass, but his Edict of Nantes in 1598 assured liberty of conscience and worship

to his friends. The speedy erection of colleges evinced the value set on a learned ministry, and the system of self-government was recognized. The gradual narrowing of these rights, and their final abolition, lie beyond the scope of this chapter.

Holland and its sister provinces adopted the same plan. The earlier Anabaptist movement had died down into obscurity when an attack was made on the provincial rights by the mapping out of fourteen dioceses disregarding all charters. The nobles confederated to oppose Philip, and when conventicles were forbidden, the burghers attended in arms. The Presbyterian scheme of government proved most helpful in organizing, and by 1569 a conference at Emden adopted it, without, however, a supreme assembly over the various provincial synods. The Dutch Reformed Church is still on this pattern.

In Scotland also the Calvinistic doctrines and the Presbyterian plan of government were quickly assimilated. John Knox began his career at St. Andrews, was disciplined in the French galleys, during Edward's reign in

England left his mark deep in the Second Prayer-book, and, thanks to Mary, took a finishing course at Frankfort and Geneva, where he came into direct contact with Calvin. When, therefore, the Lords of Scotland covenanted for a reform on the general lines of the Second Prayer-book, he readily became the protagonist. In the first years no ministers could be found who were competent, so that elders and exhorters were the officers. But by 1560 the First Book of Discipline laid down the desirable lines: to each congregation a minister, a teacher, elders and deacons; superintendents over several congregations, readers where fully equipped ministers and teachers were not available. Presently there followed a Catechism and a Liturgy comprising the Book of Common Order with the Metrical Psalms. Rapidly there arose the full complement of graded courts, and by 1567 the whole system was legalized by the regent authorizing the statutes. Ten brief years had sufficed to evolve and establish the system, and to provide for Calvinistic doctrine and Presbyterian government a home whence

they have spread throughout the British Empire.

One important factor in the permanence of this success deserves special attention, the Genevan Bible. All Bibles in English hitherto had been massive and expensive volumes, printed in the obsolescent black letter, and manifestly designed for use in churches and libraries. Some English exiles at Geneva decided on an appeal to the people at large, and after experimenting with the New Testament and the Psalms, they produced by 1560 a complete Bible, which was issued in portable form and at a popular price. It contained an Address to the Brethren in England, Scotland, and Ireland, which met with a ready response, and after revision it secured such popularity that before 1644 more than 150 editions had been sold. Now its importance here is that it contained not only summaries of contents, but explanatory notes in such abundance that it was almost a commentary. These were of the Calvinistic type to be expected in Geneva.

The General Assembly bade every parish in Scotland subscribe for a handsome copy, and

an Act of 1579 bade every substantial householder buy one. This in itself assured the permanence of the system north of the Tweed. To the south there were no such measures of authorization ; but the writings of bishops, as well as of representative men like Shakespeare and Bunyan, show that this was the Bible in current use right down to the days of the Long Parliament. Calvinistic notes ever before the eyes of the readers did much for the strength of the movement which we have now to trace in England. But when its language was largely adopted in the royal version of 1611, and when cheap Dutch reprints of this undersold the Genevan, its popularity slowly waned, and with its disappearance from England waned the popularity of the system whence it sprang and which it upheld.

II. CALVIN'S INFLUENCE IN ENGLAND

Foreign reformers had not exerted much influence in England. Taverner under Thomas Cromwell's patronage had translated a few Lutheran books ; Bucer and À Lasco had

leavened the learned circles; but till Mary drove Englishmen into the arms of Bullinger at Zurich or Calvin at Geneva there was an insularity about the English Reformation. Had Knox been able to take up his residence again in England, he would have had a wider field; but reasoning from the bad examples of Mary Tudor and Mary of Guise, he sounded most inopportunately a trumpet-blast against the 'Monstrous Regiment of Women,' which wrecked his chance of working with Elizabeth, while it seemed to find fresh justification from Mary Stuart. But if we recall the fact that 1557-1567 were crucial years in Scotland, 1557-1569 in the Netherlands, 1559-1589 in France, we see how inevitable it was that the same period should witness a great bid for success in England. And we shall see that nothing but a determined queen hindered that success.

At first her attention was needed elsewhere, for she had to reckon with the Roman Catholics left in power by Mary. The third Act of Uniformity was aimed at them rather than at the Puritans, and so these gathered strength

till there emerged a leader in Thomas Cartwright, professor of divinity at Cambridge. When in 1570 the breach with Rome was consummated, he naturally thought that Elizabeth's temporizing policy might be abandoned. He therefore published a programme of reform demanding the abolition of archbishops and archdeacons; that bishops should preach and pray, deacons should care for the poor; that the government of the church should be not by chancellors or archdeacons' officials, but by minister and elders; that ministers should be chosen by the congregation, not created by the bishop. Hitherto the importance of the programme had been obscured by a controversy as to the exact ritual to be observed, but henceforth there was a clearer idea what was at stake. Cartwright and his friends did not altogether object to civil superintendents of the clergy, as Cromwell had acted, or as the civilian Lords of the Admiralty to-day govern the professional sailors; the Lutherans and the Scotch afforded some precedent here; but presently even this offer of concession disappeared, and the

Presbyterian plan came to be pleaded for as of divine right.

Now in one respect Calvin's influence was not merely supreme, but was unchallenged till 1620; his theology was thoroughly accepted by all Protestants in England. Sovereign and bishops no less than laity and ministers, all were bred on the *Institutio* or its daughter books, while even the official Articles of the Church of England breathed the same air. The conflict then was chiefly on the question of organization; and as a detail of this, on the training of the ministry.

Elizabeth in the first few years of her reign had had to supply several hundred pastors for vacant livings; the quality of the supply admittedly left much to be done in completing the training. Many bishops therefore encouraged frequent meetings of the clergy for study of the Bible, with open discussion. In some dioceses, Peterborough especially, the ministers gathered weekly for a sermon, and followed it with a joint session of ministers, mayor and justices, to look into cases of manners and conduct, which were presented

by men sworn for the purpose in each parish. So far these developments took place with the direct approval and help of the bishops. But some ministers were ready to go further, and as early as 1572 there was a meeting at Wandsworth when a regular presbytery was organized on the familiar pattern, lacking nothing but external legal sanction. Such voluntary organizations are quite familiar to us; monthly fraternal meetings of clergy in a large town, Keswick conventions where clergy and laity meet yearly for study, representative houses of laymen which meet alongside official convocations. But any voluntary organization then was a suspicious novelty, when the initiative was reserved to the Government. We again have learned by experience that some of the most salutary features in our Constitution have come out of unofficial modifications; no law recognizes the functions or even the existence of a Cabinet or a Prime Minister, who have quietly assumed their importance by custom approving certain changes. But of this process the statesmen and ecclesiastics of Elizabeth had no experience, and they knew

well that their system, dating only from 1559, was not so stable after only thirteen years that a well-understood and rival system could be allowed to grow up within it, perhaps some day to split and ruin the episcopal cocoon and come forth as a perfect Presbyterian butterfly.

Yet while the chief danger was from the foreign Catholics, Elizabeth was obliged still to temporize. Indeed, her appointment of Grindal as primate of all England shows how hard it was for her to find an instrument of the kind she sought, for he was an earnest Puritan, and the party ideals seemed in a fair way to be realized. When called upon to restrain the 'prophesyings' and other practices that were growing, he issued a set of orders which distinctly legalized them. He was suspended from his functions, and the Queen as supreme governor of the Church issued orders to the bishops to stop these innovations. The Presbyterians took up the gauntlet, and by 1583 published an English edition of the *Directory, or Book of Discipline*, in which the public was invited to see a thoroughly planned

scheme intended to supplant the episcopal system inherited from the old régime.

‘All ecclesiastical government in the parishes was vested in a pastor, elders, deacons and widows. The ministers of twelve parishes combined to form a classis to handle matters common to the parishes. Delegates from the ministers and elders of twenty-four classes formed a provincial synod or council, and the delegates from these synods formed the national synod or general assembly. In these bodies was vested the entire ecclesiastical authority. The prince was a member of the Church, not its head; he was to obey the decrees of the Church, not to declare or formulate them.’ Therefore Elizabeth Tudor would have nothing of this system, and with the opportune death of Grindal she found at last, in Whitgift, a man who thoroughly understood this plan and was as opposed to it as herself. The campaign of repression opened in earnest.

Petitions might pour in from the gentry, Martin Marprelate might hold up the bishops as laughing-stocks, but they had the law on

their side, with physical force to back it. The High Commissions for Canterbury, York, Wales and Ireland are reckoned to have evicted a third of the clergy. The Puritan answer was to found and endow lectureships as distinct from parochial livings—a move met by suppressing the institution, or at least requiring the bishop's consent to a given man occupying such a post.

With the defeat of the Armada and the passing of the fear from the Catholics, Elizabeth struck harder. Cartwright and Snape were prosecuted; Nicholas Udall was indicted for a book against episcopal government, and it was adjudged to have libelled the Queen; for this offence he died in prison. Bancroft then stepped forward as a literary champion and expounded the whole scheme with unsympathetic criticisms. He showed that there had been an underground establishment of the Presbyterian system, with regular meetings in a score of counties, and with national synods for the last few years. These measures succeeded; it became clear that the Puritan clergy had not behind them the weight of

public opinion they had hoped to gather, or that at least this opinion would not assert itself against a queen who was the idol of the nation, and who in this matter was determined to remain queen. A minute-book of a classis in Essex stops in 1589 with the acknowledgement that the Bishop of London was examining too closely. During the rest of the reign the episcopal system gained in prestige, while the Presbyterians were hushed to silence.

The coming of James to the throne reopened the question. He had been trained in the Presbyterian scheme, and was certainly a staunch Calvinist in doctrine; it might be that he would legalize at least a limited episcopal system, where each bishop might be assisted by a council of ministers in administration—a plan which met the approval of Archbishop Usher, and is actually now adopted in many dioceses outside England. The Millenary Petition, however, failed to influence him; the adulation of the bishops captured him, and almost the only concession he made to the Puritans at the Hampton Court Con-

ference was that a new version of the Bible should be prepared. This, though they saw it not, was their death-warrant, for it involved the gradual supersession of the Genevan Bible, with all its arguments and notes. For the rest, James, on his own mere authority, varied the Prayer-book in some few respects, and then enforced uniformity at short notice, leading to a dramatic silencing and ejection of hundreds of ministers.

And yet there came another opportunity, due to the autocratic methods of the Stuarts provoking reaction. The ecclesiastical courts had long excited the jealousy of civil statesmen; Burghley had opposed Whitgift, and Coke now took the same side, leading Parliament to declare against them. James decided for the bishops, untrammelled by any civil power. So pleased was he with them, that in three years he restored episcopacy in Scotland, appointed bishops, and put out a new code—on his bare authority. Next, with some possible hint from the Scotch wapenshaws, he ordered that after service on Sunday there should be regular athletic and military exer-

cises—an order that scandalized the Puritans, with their new conception of fitting occupations on the Sabbath. And thus James affronted his subjects not only on an ecclesiastical matter, but in constitutional and social matters also.

Towards the end of his reign there was also a sign of a reaction against the doctrines of Calvin. James had declined to let the bishops add the strict Lambeth Articles to the previous symbols, though the Irish Church did adopt them in 1615. But when the Dutch synod of Dort was held to consider the teachings of Arminius, James indeed sent over some English divines who quite agreed with the reaffirmation of the Five Points of Calvinism; yet the disputes thus made prominent brought to the front a new school of thought in England, of whom a leading exponent is Bishop Andrewes. It is significant that in 1620 it was needful to announce that discussions on these topics were forbidden outside university circles.

With the accession of Charles one of this new school got his hands on the levers of

power, and Laud in his memoranda not only marked the Puritans to be checked in their career, but marked those of the new school as 'Orthodox,' an inversion of terms strange in that age. When a bishop was thrown into prison for his sympathy with the Puritan doctrine and ritual, despite his upholding episcopal authority, the Puritan cause seemed lost. There set in a wholesale emigration which in ten years carried out of the land some 40,000 of the staunchest Presbyterians, and seemed to mark the defeat of their cause in Britain.

Yet Laud had mined the ground beneath his feet. It was all very well to put Scottish bishops on the Privy Council, to introduce there the English ritual and a High Commission to enforce it, to create a new diocese of Edinburgh, to put out new canons on the mere authority of the king, to authorize a new liturgy; but the capital broke into riot, the nation sprang to covenant against these innovations, and the bishops fled at once. A General Assembly abolished all this in a week or two, and after Charles found that no

English army would fight to enforce his scheme, he reluctantly gave way and assented to an Act of Assembly re-establishing Presbyterianism in Scotland.

Then came England's turn, and soon Charles had to hear of a huge petition that the Church might be reformed root and branch, which led on to a Grand Remonstrance from Parliament. He had to abolish the High Commission, to appoint several Puritans as bishops, and to consent to the disappearance of all bishops from Parliament. But beyond this point he refused to give way, and whether as king at Whitehall, or as general at Oxford, or as prisoner at Carisbrook, he resolutely declined to hear of the Presbyterian scheme being erected complete.

Parliament therefore acted without him. It formed an important committee of ten lords and twenty commoners, with one hundred and twenty-one co-opted clergy, to draft ecclesiastical plans; the initiative being reserved to the members of Parliament with eight Scotch commissioners. This 'Assembly of Divines,' as it was popularly called, had six

pieces of work referred to it. A revision of the doctrinal Articles was never completed, but a Confession and two Catechisms were prepared, which were accepted by Parliament and also by the Scotch Assembly, and have become the standards of the English-speaking Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. In ritual matters they prepared a Directory and a Psalter, deciding that the Bible version of 1611 stood in no need of revision; and here, too, their report was approved. But when they proposed to entrust ordination to presbyters only, Parliament declined, and insisted on joining laymen in the Act. And when they wished to give the clergy full power of discipline, Parliament again declined and allowed for appeals, with itself as a supreme court. Finally, when they proposed the complete Presbyterian scheme of government, Parliament horrified the divines by asking for proof that this was of divine right. To the Puritans this had become almost axiomatic; for seventy years the Genevan Bible had fostered the idea, while Cartwright and the Scotch had proclaimed that this was the one

plan clearly seen in the New Testament, and intended as a permanent pattern. The Assembly was so staggered at this challenge that it never found time to reply. But the pleas of Travers had produced long ago the incisive comment of Hooker: 'The plain intent of the Book of Ecclesiastical Discipline is to show that men may not devise laws of Church government, but are bound for ever to use and to execute only those which God Himself hath already devised and delivered in the Scripture. . . . Touching points of doctrine . . . they have been since the first hour that there was a Church in the world, and till the last they must be believed. But as for matters of regiment, they are for the most part of another nature. To make new articles of faith and doctrine no man thinketh lawful; new laws of government what commonwealth or Church is there which maketh not either at one time or another?'

The judicious Hooker in these sentences shows the extent of Calvin's influence. The Presbyterian scheme of government, which really was not his, and only embodied some of

his methods, has appealed to a somewhat select circle, for it needs a fair amount of intelligence to work it. In Scotland, with a high level of education, it enlists practically all; in other lands, only the more cultured, leaving the democracy to adopt other methods simpler and more direct, and the aristocracy to retain a more autocratic system. But his exposition of doctrine has been widely recognized as embodying certain elements plainly set forth by the apostles, even if these need to be set in new perspective, and to be supplemented by others which he overlooked. And thus Calvinistic doctrine is taught to-day in every land where Dutch, Scotch, or English have penetrated. And everywhere it has proved itself a discipline that trains men of fibre, tenacity, devotion, and upright life.

IV

THE INDEPENDENT IDEA AS ELABORATED IN ENGLAND

National Churches ; Papal monarchy ; Clerical republic ; Theocratic democracies.

- (i) Origin—(a) The foreign Anabaptist element—Organization at Augsburg—Self-government claimed for each band of believers—Chiliastic episode—Opposition to Lutheranism—Immigration (pp. 99-105); (b) The native Lollard element, 1375-1521 (pp. 105-107); (c) The resultant revival—Browne's *Reformation without tarrying*—Conventicle Act—Gathered Churches with a mutual covenant—National organization held to be anti-christian (pp. 107-111).
- (ii) Embodiments of the idea—(a) The Independents, really Brownists—Dissenting brethren in the Assembly—The Savoy revision of the Westminster Confession—Stress on organization—Membership of children (pp. 112-115); (b) The Baptists—Aim at a visible Church of perfect purity—Propagandism—Lay preaching—Character the basis of sovereignty (pp. 115-119); (c) The Friends—Mystics—George Fox—Inner Light—Fifth-monarchism a cross-current (pp. 119-123).
- (iii) Relation to State and to Church—Democratic ecclesiastically, often politically—Primitive organization, repudiation of complex forms—Civil loyalty where conscience is respected—Divine authority of each Church for certain purposes—Opposition to a 'State-Church'—Variety in doctrine—Ethical aims in State as in each Church—Revival of monastic principle—Charge of human freedom (pp. 123-130).

LECTURE IV

THE INDEPENDENT IDEA AS ELABORATED IN ENGLAND

FOUR great ideas as to Church fellowship were in conflict during the first century of the Reformation. The conception of national Churches, long familiar in the East, became potent in the West also. The Roman conception of a papal monarchy found new exponents in the Jesuits, who greatly enlarged its scope. A third great system practically worked out on national lines, but the governing power was lodged in no king nor pope, nor in any permanent official, being vested in a republican assembly of ministers and elders. The fourth conception differs radically from all three, challenging the customs of centuries, appealing with Calvin to the Bible, especially to the New Testament, finding there a type of government

which it sought to reproduce unaltered, believing that it was of divine appointment, and best adapted for the divine purpose of nurturing the individual spiritual life. Declining to advance beyond the single congregation, it opposed on principle all extensive or complicated organization, and thus has often escaped notice except at special crises; any men of statesmanlike ability have had but a narrow sphere wherein to attract attention. Yet it is no light thing to have won the testimony, 'It is by the sects . . . that the English added to what was done by Luther and Calvin, and advanced beyond the sixteenth-century ideas.'¹

I. ORIGIN

While this result was characteristically English, yet it only fructified as pollen from abroad fell upon the native pistil. Lollardry by itself was no longer fertile; it needed to be vivified either by Anabaptism or by Calvinism. Of the latter influence there is no need to speak further: of Anabaptism we should understand a little.

¹ Acton, *Modern History*, p. 200.

1. *The Foreign Anabaptist Element*

We need not discuss how the sixteenth-century Anabaptists are related to earlier Anti-paedobaptist parties, nor whether they represent a European modification of the ancient Paulicians of Armenia; nor need we regard the political affinities with the social revolts of the Common Man in the later Middle Ages; it may suffice if we begin, like Lindsay,¹ with the religious groups of the Brethren.

Three conferences from 1524 to 1527, in Waldshut and Augsburg, organized many praying circles into an elaborate system governed by synods in a fashion imitated thirty years later by the French Reformed Churches, and well known ever since as Presbyterian. But one unique feature, not imitated, was the establishment of an order of itinerant missionaries who devoted themselves to propagandism. The spiritual life was nourished by a vernacular Bible, the old German version far earlier than Luther, by a hymnbook which is as clear a mark of Anabaptist influence as a psalmbook

¹ *History of the Reformation*, ii., 433.

is of Calvinist, and by a catechism for the young, which was printed in German, French, Bohemian, and perhaps Italian. Most characteristic was a Directory for Christian Living, for it shows the aim of the whole movement, the fostering and maintenance of a high level of spiritual life. Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* were also directed to train the conduct, but by the means of breaking the will ; the Anabaptist sought to develop it aright in constant social fellowship.

Great differences showed themselves in the accidental developments, but the essential aims were well expressed by a deputation that waited on the town council of Zurich in 1523. 'They insisted that an Evangelical Church must differ from the Roman Church in this among other things, that it should consist of members who had made a personal profession of faith in their Saviour, and who had vowed to live in obedience to Jesus Christ their' Captain. 'It could not be like a State Church, whether Romanist or other, to which people belonged without any individual profession of faith. They insisted that the Church, thus

formed, should be free from all civil control, to decide for itself what doctrines and ceremonies of worship were founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto, and should make this decision according to the opinions of a majority of the members. They further asked that the Church should be free to exercise, by brotherly admonition and, as a last resort, by excommunication, discipline on such of its members as offended against the moral law. They also declared that the Church which thus rejected State control ought to refuse State support, and proposed that the tithes should be secularized.'¹

One section of the Anabaptists was captured by an enthusiastic band of Millenarians, and became persuaded that the kingdom of God was to be established forthwith. The tragedy of Münster is a sad episode; sad not only for this perversion from principle, and because the obloquy due to the bishop and his troops has been most ingeniously transferred to men who were acting largely on constitutional lines, and only fought in self-defence; but sad in that

¹ *Lindsay*, ii., 445.

the whole Anabaptist movement was henceforth viewed with alarm and horror both in Germany and abroad, the effects whereof persist even till to-day.

The Anabaptists did their best to disclaim the proceedings of Münster, and a great conference held the very next year at Bockholt, a town not far away, saw an explicit repudiation of the Chiliastic doctrine and of its application in the forcible appeal to arms. But the mischief was done; King Henry, the Emperor Charles, and every other potentate, regarded them as mere outlaws; beheading, burning, and drowning swept away thousands of non-resisting victims in the Netherlands; Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were set to hunt down the refugees who swarmed into the eastern and southern towns of England; and even Elizabeth thought them so far beyond the pale of charity that they furnished the last Protestant martyrs of her reign. Yet the Articles of the Church of England do not repeat the mistakes as to what they really held; and when we recall the emphasis laid on the Bible, the ready reception of humanist influence, shown in the recogni-

tion of the freedom of the will, and the inheritance from mediaeval times of a stress laid on the Imitation of Christ, with an indifference to or vehement opposition to the novel doctrine of Justification by Faith, there seems little to excite the alarm of the authorities. As it is, they have won from Lord Acton the emphatic remark that they are 'the most original and spiritual remnant of the German Reformation.'

2. *The Native Lollard Element*

From about A.D. 1375 John Wyclif had headed a movement for reform which expressed itself in groups of poor preachers, in tracts appealing both to scholars and to the commonalty, and in an English Bible which became so popular that it speedily stopped the copying of the Latin Bible. The stress that he laid on this was novel and revolutionary. 'Jesus Christ our Lawgiver has given a law sufficient in itself for the government of the whole militant Church.' Then on matters of organization he thus declared himself in his *Dialogue*: 'In the time of Paul, two orders of clergy sufficed, namely, those of priest and deacon

. . . presbyters and bishops were one and the same.' Therefore it is not surprising that before 1390 the Lollard priests were ordaining others, and that the movement spread apace.

The higher clergy favoured the Lancastrian revolution, and the Lancastrian kings favoured a persecution of the Lollards, which ended their influence as a political party. But the religious opinions persisted, and Lincoln College was founded at Oxford, in 1427, expressly to combat them. A generation later Bishop Pecock of Chichester wrote against 'Biblemen' whose leading principle was that nothing was to be esteemed a law of God, unless it was founded on Scripture.

So far as we can judge from the registers of heresies, the strength of the Lollards lay henceforward in the large towns, and in the rural districts of East Anglia, Essex, the east of Berkshire, and the south of Buckingham and Oxford-shires. About 1506 we hear of a close inquisition at Amersham, and as late as 1521 Bishop Longland of Lincoln discovered that the English Bible was still read, with English tracts against mariolatry, pilgrimages,

images, and that the sacrament of the altar was lightly esteemed. The date assures us that not Tyndale's, but Wyclif's influence was dominant, and that Luther had not risen above their horizon.

Ten years later some men of Chesham were listening to a Londoner who had been beyond the sea in Almany, and knew of the reforms there put in practice; and by 1547 I. B. was printing *A Brife and Faythfull declaration of the true fayth of Christ*, which gives abundant evidence that Lollards and Anabaptists had met; while Nicholas Dorcastor seven years later published *The Hymbel and vnfamed confessiō of the belefe of certain poore banished men, grounded vpon the holy Scriptures of God*, which shows a blending of Lutheran elements also, for he printed it at Wittonburge.

3. *The Resultant Revival*

The later Lollard movement had embraced very few clergy, if any; the ministers were to the outward eye mere laymen. But the ferment caused by the foreign teaching of Luther,

the Anabaptists, and Calvin, influenced more clergy. Prominent among these was Robert Browne of Stamford, who by 1580 was so far settled in his views that he organized at Norwich a new company of believers, which was speedily driven abroad to Middleburgh. Here he published his exhortation to the temporizing Puritans in *A Treatise of Reformation without tarying for Anie*, and a programme of reform in a *Book which sheweth the Life and Manners of All True Christians*. He taught that a Church ought to be gathered by a covenant between the members to offer and give up themselves to be of the Church and people of God, likewise offering and giving up their children and others, being under age, if they were of the household and in the full power of the covenant.

Browne repudiated the charge that he was indebted to the Anabaptists; but when we see the names of Norwich, Yarmouth, Middleburgh, we recognize that he was in an Anabaptist atmosphere, and was unconsciously influenced by them.

All parties united to disavow his new move-

ment. If he charged Cartwright with backwardness in reform, he had soon to acknowledge that the Presbyterians repressed him. 'Though the names of pastors, doctors, and presbyters be lawful, being found in the scriptures, yet a pope or proud popeling may ly hyd vnder the names. . . . This haue I found by experience to be trewe, both in forreine contries and in myne owne contrie. I can testifie by trial of Scotland. . . . In England also I haue found much more wronge done me by the preachers of discipline than by anie the Byshops.' So he wrote in 1588, when he had outwardly conformed, albeit in a most mutinous state of mind. His personal recantation, however, did not end a movement which gathered into itself many streams; and in 1593 Elizabeth found it needful to begin the session of Parliament with a Conventicle Act providing that everybody above the age of sixteen who obstinately stayed away from public worship should be imprisoned until submission were made.

At Middleburgh his influence persisted so that the chaplain to the English merchants

invited them to sign a document promising, 'Wee doe willinglie ioyn together to live as the Church of Christ, watchinge one over another, and submitinge our selves vnto them, to whom the Lorde Jesus committeth the oversight of his Church, guidinge and censuringe vs according to the rule of the worde of God.' This was too strong meat for the merchants, and the chaplain resigned, became pastor of a frankly illegal conventicle in London, and emigrated again with it to Amsterdam, where they published a *Confession* setting out explicitly and elaborately the Separatist ideal. One article deals plainly with the position of a sovereign in a separated Church: 'Euery member of ech Christian congregation, howv excellent, great, or learned soeuer, ought to be subiect to this censure and iudgment of Christ [through the vvholl body together of the congregation]; yet ought not the Church vvithout great care and due advise to procede against such publick persons.'

Thinkers sought to trace the genesis of such views, and Dr. Some saw that 'Brownism was mere Anabaptism.' A sign of the deep

cleavage between this movement and its predecessors was the application made of the prophecies of Antichrist. Mediaeval sects had long identified this with the Church of Rome, and many Elizabethan divines adopted this view. But the Separatists declared that the whole principle of an organization on a large scale was antichristian, whether that organization was of the Roman type, or the Elizabethan type, or the Presbyterian type. Thus Barrowe, on being pressed as to his view of the office of Whitgift, declared that his holding a double office, ecclesiastical and civil, identified him as the Second Beast of the Revelation. And John Smith recognized the Mark of the Beast to be imprinted on the forehead of all his subjects, in the application of water to the forehead of infants to enrol them in the National Church.

II. EMBODIMENTS OF THE IDEA

The Separatists of Elizabeth's reign laid down clearly the principles, but it took nearly forty years before these were manifested in outward practice. The strength of the

Government was enough to drive them underground until the general relaxation of 1641. Within six years of that time there were apparent three distinct groups of Churches, all organized on the general lines indicated. From that time onwards the Independents, the Baptists, and the Friends have been persistent factors in the religious life of the English people.

1. *The Independents*

These were not the first to emerge in England, but in New England they had worked out their principles from 1629. When, therefore, the Assembly of Divines was convoked, five or ten ministers were found who dissented from the general preference for Presbyterianism, and pleaded for Churches independent of any central authority. In doctrine they were wholly Calvinist, with no tincture of Anabaptist teaching. In government also they were Calvinist, preferring Calvin's own plan complete for one city, and opposing the French-Anabaptist synodical scheme. In these respects they testify that

Lollardism could be and was renewed to life not by Anabaptism alone, but by the other foreign influence of Calvinism. But they undoubtedly arrived at the central result that Churches were to stand 'independent' of the civil power, and this gave them their name.

Herein they were at one with the Brownists, but the discovery was not very welcome. It would seem, however, that many species were content to lose distinctive names, and become known merely by the generic title of Independent. Not till 1658 did this unity of sentiment find conscious expression, when a conference was held at the Savoy of representatives from 120 Churches. This step was taken with some trepidation, and the practical agreement evinced seems rather to have astonished the members. They took the Westminster Confession and adopted it with significant alterations. Thus as to the civil magistrate, they refused to acknowledge that he had authority to preserve unity and peace in the Church, and therefore to call synods: they declared, on the contrary, that 'in such differences about the Doctrines of the Gospel,

or ways of the worship of God, as may befall men exercising a good conscience, manifesting it in their conversation, and holding the foundation, not disturbing others in their ways or worship that differ from them: there is no warrant for the magistrate under the Gospel to abridge them of their liberty.' They also cancelled two whole chapters: Of Church Censures, Of Synods and Councils, and substituted a long exposition of Independent Church Polity. In each Church they contemplated a staff of pastors, teachers, elders and deacons; and they permitted public maintenance of public preachers and pastors, who were, however, not to dispense the seals to any but the saints. The administration of the seals was confined to the teaching officers.

In these respects the Independents reveal their Calvinistic descent. But in another respect they came into sharp collision, not only with those of Anabaptist descent, but with many thinkers within their own circle. Browne's teaching that heads of families were to covenant for themselves, their children, and their dependents, was reiterated in 1596. After

much discussion on this point, Thomas Hooker set forth in 1645 the principles usually adopted in New England, embodying these two dogmas: 'Visible saints are the only true and meet matter, whereof a visible Church should be gathered. . . . Children of such, who are members of congregations, ought only to be baptized.' Logicians pointed out, what experience presently verified, that in this way the second generation would include several who had never covenanted for themselves, and might have no strong religious feeling. Thus the question arose which Luther and Zwingli had had to face, of the compatibility of infant baptism with the existence of Gathered Churches. The Independents are that class of Separatists who decided to try to reconcile the two.

2. *The Baptists*

Two distinct bodies of Baptists arose, the earlier, in 1609, from the direct influence of the Anabaptists, thus inheriting some of their doctrines, notably an emphasis on free-will and the salvability of all men; adopting also

their synodical organization, which received approval in Britain when the Long Parliament legalized it, and the Scotch put it in force; the later from the Separatists of Calvinistic doctrine, who, in obedience to the logic of Separatism, abandoned infant baptism, and insisted on every member making direct individual profession of his faith. Utterly different as the organization and history of the two bodies have been, there is no need here to discriminate, for they agreed in their central doctrine. This may well be stated in the words of Bishop Creighton, originally uttered as part of a lecture in Great St. Mary's at Cambridge—

‘The strength of the Baptists has lain in their readiness to appeal to the people and speak a tongue which all could understand. . . . We of the Church of England are separated from the Baptists in our conception of the nature and function of the Church of Christ. Much controversy has raged about infant baptism, but this does not really touch the main question in dispute. The reservation of baptism for adults is merely the outward

expression of a desire to set up the visible Church as a body of pure and regenerate believers—in fact, to make the visible Church correspond with the invisible Church which exists only in the knowledge of God. The aim of the Baptists is higher than that of the Congregationalists, who discarded the idea of a visible Church that they might affirm the rights of separate congregations. The Baptists, on the other hand, affirmed the right of freedom from outward control, not as an object in itself, but as a condition necessary for the discharge of their duty to create a visible Church of perfect purity.’

Thus an early assembly of the General Baptists declared, ‘That the chief or only ends of a people baptized according to the command of God, when they meet together as the congregation or fellowship of Christ, are, or ought to be, for to walk suitably; or to give up themselves unto a holy conformity to all the laws or ordinances of Jesus Christ, answerable to the gifts and graces received, improving them for the glory of God and the edification of each other in love.’

From the Anabaptists they inherited the stress laid on evangelism. The preaching of the gospel in Wales was urged by Baptists, and largely accomplished by their means under the guidance of Vavasor Powell. An order of evangelists, or 'Messengers,' was an integral part of the system of the General Baptists, and while a large part of England was regularly districted for the purpose, Ireland and the American colonies were also evangelized occasionally. They courted debates, they published confessions specifying, 'That as it is an ordinance of Christ, so it is the duty of His Church, in His authority to send forth such brethren as are fitly gifted and qualified through the spirit of Christ, to preach the gospel to the world.'

The Baptists laid great stress on lay preaching, a natural corollary from their principles. Samuel How published *On the Sufficiency of the Holy Spirit*, depreciating mere human learning. Some long debates were necessary till it was acknowledged that preachers ought to be tested and commissioned by some Church before they should exercise their gifts. Prac-

tice shows few ministers told off from secular employment; Bunyan the brazier, Caffin the farmer, and Kiffin the merchant were among the most eminent Baptist ministers of the seventeenth century.

There is one respect in which the Baptists modernized and applied one of Wyclif's most startling doctrines, that a king was God's vicar as much as a pope; nay, that every Christian held directly from God; the Baptists stated this in the form that all believers were priests, with right of direct access. Thus the early Baptists revived, if they did not inherit, one of the most striking of Wyclif's dogmas. And they did more, they put it in practice.

3. *The Society of Friends*

The Independents were nearly all Calvinist. Baptists were in two groups, influenced respectively by Calvin and by the Anabaptists; from the latter of these evolved the third great body of evangelicals, which was organized by George Fox into the Society of Friends. They had precursors in various Continental mystics; Catherine of Siena, Tauler, and

Schwenkfeld, however dissimilar in ecclesiastical relations, had much in common with Fox; and the stress he laid on the Inner Light won him numerous adherents in his Continental tours. But his itinerations in England were constant, and it was within the four seas that most of his converts were gathered. With them, too, the eccentricities of a few have obscured the real value and the real principles of the community, and it is well to let one of themselves speak—

‘As respects their theological belief, the Friends have never acknowledged any strictly defined creed, but have, nevertheless, been generally successful in steering a middle course between latitudinarianism on the one hand, and on the other any such rigidity of doctrine as may be inconsistent with the exercise, by every individual member, of a healthy free thought, recognizing the divine authority of the Bible, but at the same time repudiating human claims to prescribe authoritatively for others the meaning and extent of scriptural doctrine.

‘While eminently loyal to the civil govern-

ment and earthly monarch, they do not, in the slightest degree, recognize the sovereign's claim to be entitled "the Head of the Church"; for they hold, practically as well as theoretically, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only real possessor of that title. . . . The king or queen, the archbishops or bishops are, in their eyes, invested with no more religious authority, or ecclesiastical reverence, than the humblest Christians in the land.

'The Friend cherishes a special sense of his individual and inalienable responsibility to God, before whose judgement-seat he knows that each one must render a separate untransferable account of the actions and omissions of his life. . . . Even in their own religious assemblies they do not enforce on themselves detailed uniformity of system or action. . . .

' . . . Their views of the perceptible presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the obedient, are perhaps more definite than those of any other denomination. They repudiate (as a body, and on scriptural grounds) the lawfulness of war, state-churches, slavery, oaths, and capital punishment. They also

differ in some other respects from most of their fellow Christians, as, for instance, in the non-payment of preachers, the absence of collegiate or special training for ministerial service, the permission of public religious instruction by women, and the restriction of the nature of sacraments to a spiritual and invisible union with the Lord.

‘In connexion with these views there are three very important characteristics of the Friends which claim special attention, viz. their freedom from the prevalent “one man system” in Church matters; their practical adoption of the . . . principle that it is a primary duty of every religious community to care for, and, when necessary, to maintain its poorer members; and that it is a third requirement of the Church to secure to all the children of its adherents a good education to qualify them for religious, moral, and civil usefulness.’¹

While these three well-recognized groups exhibit the leading embodiments of the idea

¹ Tallack, *George Fox, &c.*, pp. 2-4.

that the Church is independent of the State, there was one strong, if temporary, cross-current that confused the issues at the time: Fifth-monarchism. A study of the visions in the Book of Daniel convinced many men in all sections that the four monarchies had had their day, and that the fifth monarchy was at hand, when the saints would rule under Christ. This Chiliastic or Millenarian line of thought was widely entertained, and occasionally provoked the organization of Churches whose members had this sole tenet as a bond of union. But the phenomenon rapidly passed away, and left simply three bodies which have proven themselves stable.

III. RELATION TO STATE AND TO CHURCH

The differences between these three bodies have been sufficiently explained: the important likeness is that they all hold one theory as to their relations with the State. Congregationalists and Baptists also hold one theory as to their own proper method of organization. They interpret the New Testament Church as a theocratic congregation, which

recognizes Christ as its only head, and administers its own affairs in accordance with His will as expressed in the New Testament. This type they seek to reproduce, so that to an outsider they appear self-governing democracies; to themselves they appear Christ-governed theocracies. They are the simple cell-forms, which refuse on principle to lose their identity in more complex bodies. They may aggregate for consultative purposes, they do not organize for legislative purposes. And if any one Church disagrees seriously with the policy of any association or union to which it belongs, it is perfectly free to cease associating with its sister Churches and to follow what it believes the better course.

Borgeaud has pointed out that this line of thought can readily be followed out in the political sphere, as well as the ecclesiastical; and he traces the rise of the republic, both in England and America, to those who had imbibed this view from the Bible.

It is to be noted, however, that whereas the Anabaptists had scruples about the Oath, the Sword, the Magistracy, which were transmitted

through the General Baptists to the Friends, yet these are not characteristic of the other bodies ; and the right of magistrates to require civil obedience is asserted by all. But while they are recognized as servants of God to maintain order in the State, the Churches claim that they themselves are equally servants of God in the religious sphere—nay, that they are habitations of God. They give the fullest possible sense to the utterance, spoken in relation to Church business and not merely in relation to worship, that where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, He is present. They believe themselves heirs of the promise that they receive the Holy Spirit, and that the sins of those are forgiven to whom they forgive, the sins of those are retained when they retain them. They act under Christ's authority in making disciples for Him, in baptizing them, in training them ; and they claim His presence when thus occupied in His service.

With this highest of High Church doctrine, they can brook no interference by the State in matters where they conceive they act under

the direct authority of Christ. So far from admitting the right of the State to govern them, they regard the State as acting *ultra vires* in any attempt to restrain them in any of these matters of mutual discipline, excommunication, forgiveness, evangelization, enrolment, education. And to any such attempt they return the respectful apostolic reply, 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye.'

The Roman emperors recognized the menace to their empire in this principle, and soon declared war upon its supporters. Civil rulers have ever felt a danger in the avowal that they will be obeyed in their own sphere only, and that there is a sphere also in which they hold no authority from God, in which Churches and individuals decline to allow them any voice except that of mere private members seeking to understand and obey. This avowal was regarded by Henry and Elizabeth as treason, and was punished with death, because the menace to the State was real when a vast international organization claimed to be 'The

Church.' But the Independent Churches make precisely the same avowal, only in practice it is less anarchic—from the State standpoint—because on principle these Churches cannot merge their identity into any one vast body. There must be a multitude of congregations or Churches, each interpreting the will of Christ for itself; these may not under any circumstances fuse into one 'Church' claiming divine right, nor can they ever exalt any one committee or any one man to be their head and governor. Hence these Churches cannot be a danger to the State; nor indeed are they of much political weight, except in so far as they can educate public opinion. They have no national machinery which can be used by a political party, and it is absolutely against their principles to erect any such machinery.

The history of such bodies is obviously hard to write. Little is common to them politically except sufferings under persecution, resistance to persecution, creation of public opinion in favour of severing all relations between the State and any ecclesiastical body. Even theologically they show great

variety, and there have seldom been great developments of doctrine which affected them alone and not also the bodies beside them. Calvinism faded out from them as from the Presbyterians, remaining chiefly in the legal Free Church of Scotland and the Particular Baptists of England; but Calvinism had faded earlier from the Established Church of England. Unitarianism grew among them, but hardly more than in the Episcopalians among whom they dwelt. It is in social movements that they are prominent: as the ethical motive was the constraining power with them, therefore the slave-trade, slavery, prison horrors, intemperance and kindred evils were first and most emphatically challenged from these circles.

A movement with such vitality has provoked the inquiry whence it sprang, or how the root-idea was embodied in the Middle Ages. And Jessopp has answered that this is the modern incarnation of the monastic principle. True, in that there was a revolt from the hierarchy, the elaborate organization which grew up after Constantine welded a Church into his Imperial

machinery. True more deeply, in that it was a reassertion of the rights of the laity against the assumptions of a sacerdotal priesthood. True most, in that it was an expression of a desire for holiness, not for a compromise with worldly ideals. But whereas the monks secluded themselves, and adopted celibacy, this new movement was social, and merely revived the custom of marrying only in the Lord—i.e. within the circuit of professed and covenanted Christians—a custom still enforced by a few Churches. And whereas the monks sought primarily their own salvation, these societies saw one step in advance, they were saved in order to save others, and they had a fervour of propagandism which accounts for the fact that foreign missions took their rise hence at a later time.

A sad episode at Geneva, where a blending of State and Church brought about a judicial murder, elicited from Lord Acton the reflection which may stand as a verdict on these men: 'The charge of human freedom was transferred from the Churches to the sects, from the men in authority to the men in opposition, to

Socinians and Arminians and Independents, and the Society of Friends.' Better testimony cannot be asked when we remember that the same historian declared: 'We have no thread through the enormous intricacy and complexity of modern politics, except the idea of progress towards more perfect and assured freedom, and the divine right of free men.'¹

¹ Acton, *Modern History*, pp. 136, 202.

V

PURITANISM ON THE FIELD OF ACTION

- (i) In conflict with other ideals—Mutual criticism to raise character—Indifferentism becoming vocal—Rule of the Saints—The nominated Parliament—The Tryers—Mistrust of Catholics limits religious liberty—Cavalier Parliament ends Puritan power—The Clarendon code—Dragooning in Scotland—Declaration of Indulgence—Edict of Nantes revoked—The revolution—Toleration as inferiors civilly—Puritanism expelled from the National Church (pp. 133-152).
- (ii) Free to work out its destiny in America—Virginia and Plymouth—Boston—The New England way of intolerance—Rhode Island and Pennsylvania the homes of liberty—Halfway Covenant—Whitefield's revival—Congregationalism local—Presbyterianism strong by immigration—Methodists and Baptists the evangelists—Religious freedom (pp. 152-160).

LECTURE V

PURITANISM ON THE FIELD OF ACTION

EVERY religious movement must submit to be judged by two tests: the outward change in the course of national history, the inward change it can effect in men's lives. Calvinism, whether adopted by Presbyterians or by smaller bodies, has ever been able to produce men of high character and unbending fibre: it remains to estimate its force in the outer world of action.

It is no part of our duty to study the military or political side of those who professed it: the doings of Cromwell's army and of Cromwell's Parliaments may be passed by. The only question we can hope to answer is, How did Puritan principles stand the alternate strain of success and of persecution, in the old world and in the new?

I. IN CONFLICT WITH OTHER IDEALS

There were other ideals current in England, but all religious movements had this in common, that purity of life was aimed at. The Puritans, however, put this in the very forefront and kept it resolutely there. Hence the Presbyterian scheme provided for a constant inquisition into character and conduct. Under Elizabeth the ministers of Northampton met fortnightly for such inquiry, with the bishop's approval; in Commonwealth times the same discipline was demanded, and every man and woman in a parish lived under the eyes of his neighbours, knowing that his every action might be commented upon by the kirk-session. Such mutual criticism was not unknown in the Middle Ages, at courts-leet, or in guilds, but was increasingly distasteful in an age when a new sense of personal liberty was arising.

If every man in a parish was thus to be under scrutiny, much more was the minister. Whatever other tests he might have to pass, as to education, acceptability to patron or

people, readiness to conform to the legal system, yet these were subsidiary to the great question, Is he godly? Thus Thomas Fuller, author of the *Church History of Britain*, had to appear before the Tryers, who inquired what evidence he had of his conversion. After a little pause he said, 'I make conscience of my thoughts.' Ultimately they passed him, and a Puritan minister commented that certainly to keep up to closet duty and retain God in our minds with delight, are the true marks of inward vital religion.¹

But the temper of the age in England was against such a lofty standard for minister and laymen alike. A generation was growing up which had lost the fervid devotion of the Puritan. Readers of Pepys, Evelyn, Courthop, Verney, recognize that in the upper classes there was an indifference to religion, sometimes deepening into positive aversion. The lowest classes were not exempt in this age from coarse vices. Thus it was chimerical to think that an exalted moral tone could be maintained by mutual watching. Even in Lancashire, where the

¹ *Camden Miscellany*, vol. xi, p. 70.

Presbyterian system was given such a fair trial, the minutes of the classical synods show that many stood contemptuously aloof, that many calmly disobeyed all citations, and that neither the army nor public opinion would sustain the disciplinary measures which were resolved upon.

The result was that discipline tended to collapse in the National Church, and was only enforced in the Gathered Churches, where the members had deliberately covenanted to maintain a high standard and watch over one another for mutual aid. The next step was fatally easy, for those members to persuade themselves that they alone were morally fit to rule, not only to rule themselves, but even to rule the nation. The party that believed in the Rule of the Saints found a leader in Major-General Thomas Harrison. Commander-in-Chief in England, he organized the militia out of the Gathered Churches, a militia so much in earnest that it forced Charles II off the road to London and hemmed in his invading army till Cromwell with the regular army—also recruited largely from the Saints—gave the

final blow. The next step was also easy, to invite the Gathered Churches to nominate a 'Parliament,' which for the first time met not by any pretence of popular election, but as the organ of the Saints.

Naturally, sweeping ecclesiastical measures were prepared ; the legal sanction to marriage was lodged with justices of the peace ; bills were drafted to end the payment of tithes to incumbents, and to vest the appointment of ministers in the people of the parish. These proposals, and others on secular questions, outran public opinion to such an extent that an abrupt end was put to the 'Parliament,' while Harrison and two Fifth-monarchy preachers were called before the council and silenced. Thus Cromwell broke definitely with the Saints, and henceforth it is hard to see any guiding principle in his life except the desire to maintain order. The Gathered Churches were made to feel that they, like the Presbyterians, had misused their opportunity and were deposed from power. They were formidable enough to make Cromwell refuse the Crown, but he soon cashiered all

their officers, and had to promote to the highest commands men of little principle, who found their interest in maintaining the existing state of things.

The Saints might govern themselves, but not the nation. For ecclesiastical affairs Cromwell now adopted a policy of wide tolerance, with only two limitations: that public worship according to Roman and Anglican forms was forbidden. Even this exception was probably due to military exigencies, as he feared that such gatherings might afford the means of meeting and consulting. He therefore upheld the old policy that bade Catholics keep within five miles of their homes, and that exacted from them a disproportionate share of taxation; and he extended this to Episcopalians also.

Cromwell could hardly keep order between these parties on the one hand and the Fifth-monarchy men on the other; Richard Cromwell gave up the attempt speedily, and no general could command the confidence of the army. When Monk permitted the full Long Parliament to sit again and dissolve, when a

free Convention Parliament assembled, it was evident that ecclesiastical affairs would need grave consideration.

The disciplinary side of the Presbyterian system was already rejected by the nation. But it was now evident that even the doctrinal system of the great reformer ceased to command general assent. Bishop Brownrig of Exeter, a strict Calvinist, when dying in 1659, said justly, 'I believe the king will come in, but I tremble at it, for with him will come in such numbers of the faction of Laud, as will not part with a ragge of the surplice to save the nation from a conflagration.' Perhaps even he had hardly grasped that the Laudians esteemed themselves the legitimate Churchmen, in ritual and in doctrine, and that it was he and his fellow Calvinists who were now to be treated as a faction. True that the sequestered nobility and gentry and clergy put forth a broadside declaring how far they were from revenge; true that Charles from Breda declared how careful he would be of tender consciences; but the sun of Puritanism was setting fast in the eastern hemisphere.

The Convention Parliament indeed still showed the Presbyterians powerful. They reverted to the plan of the Long Parliament to establish a limited episcopacy, surrounding every bishop with a council of presbyters, whose advice he would be bound to take. And not only were the Cavaliers ready at this stage to compromise thus, but Charles was equally ready. That a scheme of this kind, which is now proving itself throughout the Anglican Communion beyond the seas so thoroughly practical, should have miscarried, deserves attention; and the cause gives the key to the next thirty years.

Charles and James were reckoned to have too strong a liking for the faith of their mother, the Roman Catholic. The aggressiveness of the Roman Church was not yet so marked as it was in a few years, especially under Louis XIV, but the fear of a Papal reaction was growing in the popular mind, and found abundant nourishment for a generation. When, therefore, Charles proposed a general toleration, all parties suspected that he intended to relax the penal laws against

the Roman Catholics, and none were willing. In the suspicions thus created the opportunity of remodelling the constitution of the Established Church was allowed to pass.

The new Cavalier Parliament was actuated by natural feelings of revenge. Whatever changes of constitutional policy may be seen in it and in its successors, there was none in its ecclesiastical policy. This found able directors in Clarendon and Sheldon, and for five years a stream of legislation came forth which was intended to crush Puritanism.

At first the machinery had to be erected. All corporations were remodelled so that Episcopalians alone could be members, an extension of the long-continued practice of ostracizing Roman Catholics. Bishops were restored to the House of Lords. The old courts were restored, and a High Commission was re-erected, and thus the Puritan era had passed, and all the features so obnoxious from a governing point of view were made prominent. When these courts resumed work, it is noticeable that their activities were concerned with breaches of positive law rather

than of moral law; and the succeeding legislation tended to lay the stress still more on matters of form and order at the expense of conduct.

Yet it must be acknowledged that the Puritan stand for manners had not been in vain, and that some of the new hierarchy were found to take the boldest ground. Bishop Croft of Hereford, preaching before the king from the words, 'It is good for me that I have been afflicted,' said, 'Sir, you have been afflicted; but what good have your afflictions done you? Is it only to embrace a lady in your armes? After your escape at Worster the grand enemy Oliver said, "This man is escaped for some great blessing, or scourge to the nation." You may if you please make good the former; but I fear you will by the latter make him to be too true a prophet.' The same bishop gave another proof of his sense of true religion. Being dean of the royal chapel, he asked leave of Charles to go to the country at Easter. The king said, 'How can you go, when you are to give me the Sacrament on Easter Day?' He replied

that it was for that cause he desired to be absent, as while the king lived as he did, he could not in conscience give him the Sacrament.

But if Croft and Ken show an earnest desire for purity of life, Sheldon showed a more earnest desire for uniformity, with some wish for mere revenge. A conference at the Savoy now led to nothing of any real importance from the Puritan standpoint, while Parliament returned to the old Tudor policy of uniformity, which for a score of years past had been unknown. Thus there was a reversion to a liturgy, itself an offence to those who desired some freedom of worship; and the liturgy was revised in some details so as to create fresh difficulties.

Ever since 1659 several Puritans had been losing their posts, and in August of 1662 a final impulse was given by the enforcement of the new law. It has been reckoned that more than two thousand ministers quitted the Established Church in these three years; while perhaps as many again stifled some preferences or scruples, and conformed reluctantly to the new order of things.

Henceforward the great Presbyterian party, which from the days of Elizabeth had maintained its position in the Establishment, was definitely and finally thrust out. It had suffered somewhat under the Commonwealth, but it now received what proved to be its death-blow in England from a free Parliament; whereas till 1641 Parliament had been its stronghold. The nation had decided against it. In the persecution that speedily developed, the Presbyterians bore the brunt, and while they were so prominent, the Independents and the Baptists comparatively escaped notice. The Friends, however, met the full force of the storm. Some of the more excitable members of the Society had made public protest against formal worship, and behaved with ostentatious rudeness, as it seemed to their opponents. So now Friends by the hundred were committed to jail under a special Conventicle Act for their repression.

In Scotland events moved even more rapidly. A Parliament rescinded all recent legislation, and when Charles by his mere fiat restored episcopacy, it ratified his action and welcomed

new bishops. Laws were passed to fine absentees from church, and dragoons were sent through the country to enforce the new system. As under Charles I, the people sprang to arms, and conventicles were held openly, but the troops were too strong.

The Border counties of England feared a similar civil war. Even if most of the major-generals were dead or in exile, some leader might yet arise who could reassemble the invincible army; and rumours of a deep plot gained credence. The next step, therefore, was to prohibit all religious meetings by an English Conventicle Act, reiterating and extending the law of Elizabeth. This was met with open defiance. Lords of the manor sheltered groups of worshippers in their halls, and even in chapels-of-ease near their residences; barns were fitted up in hamlets; great cities saw meetings of hundreds coming openly; in London old playhouses or the halls of city companies were filled week after week.

In the parliamentary recess Charles was not eager to enforce the law, and was quite ready to permit these gatherings, if only Roman

Catholics could share in the general relaxation. But for that very reason the Parliament would not slacken. Fear of Rome, and fear of the old army, combined to produce a threat that if the law were not enforced, supplies should be withheld. And the Clarendon Code was completed by the Five Mile Act. Every minister who would not swear to acquiesce in the settlement of Church and State, was rendered innocuous by being banished five miles from any corporate town and any place where he had ministered.

Thenceforward Puritanism had the opportunity of being hardened by adversity. On Scottish moors, in English cities, conventicles met to be harried by soldiers; ministers were dragged off to prison, hearers were ruined by fines, and it seemed as if the movement might be starved out. Charles repeatedly attempted to lighten their lot, but again and again Sheldon stirred Parliament to insist on the laws being enforced, or accumulated statistics from the bishops to show what a menace the conventiclers were.

The most important of these episodes was

in 1672. The supremacy of the King in Church affairs had lately been reaffirmed by Parliament, and his needs were met by a supply of cash from France. He therefore issued a Declaration, acknowledging that uniformity was not to be attained by coercion, enforcing uniformity within the Established Church, but suspending the operation of all penal laws against both Nonconformists and Papal recusants, offering to license places of public worship for Nonconformists, and teachers therein, but allowing only private worship for Roman Catholics, and expressly forbidding meeting in unlicensed houses. This declaration was ignored by the Friends, who went on preaching without licences; it was viewed with some suspicion by Presbyterians, who saw themselves shut out of the National Church; it was welcomed by the Independents, the Baptists and the Roman Catholics. Within a year about 1,500 preachers took out licences, and about 2,800 places were registered for worship. But this experiment came to an abrupt end; if Charles had been induced to try it partly because he needed to conciliate

the soldiers and sailors, not daring to embark on the Dutch war with disaffected subjects, yet the need of money for the war obliged him to convoke Parliament, and this soon obliged him to cancel the Declaration and recall the licences. The year's peace had, however, enabled the Puritans to realize their numbers and strength, and to organize under the new conditions. If many Churches date from 1653, when Gathered Churches received such emphatic approval from Cromwell, many more date from 1672, when Charles gave them another opportunity to revive and strengthen themselves.

The interest displayed in the 'Popish plot' drew off popular attention for a few years, and not till 1682 was serious persecution renewed. Then for five or six years there was another period of repression. This coincided with other outbursts against Presbyterians elsewhere. In Scotland the Conventicle Act had been twice strengthened, landlords being made responsible for all people on their estates attending the parish churches, and at last the penalty of death being affixed to attendance

on conventicles. In France, Louis XIV had been construing the Edict of Nantes most unfavourably to the Huguenots; their children were esteemed capable of voluntary conversion at the age of seven; they were excluded from all public office; their places of worship were closed; dragoons were quartered on them; and at last, in 1685, the Edict was formally revoked. Ministers were banished, the laity were forbidden to go; but in practice the laity made their escape, and gave renewed vigour to Puritanism in Holland, England, and America, while it was 1710 before the last Camisard preacher was hunted down. Thenceforward Puritanism was of no account in France; but the warning to all Protestants was accepted, and England soon expelled her Roman Catholic king by the aid of a Presbyterian Prince of Orange.

The settlement that ensued showed the varying strength of Puritanism in the north and the south. An Assembly in Scotland, the first since 1653, restored the Presbyterian system, declining to compromise with the Episcopalians, but granting them a privileged position as dissenters from the Establishment.

And when the Union with England was accomplished, the maintenance of this settlement was guaranteed. Exactly the reverse took place in England; the fact that seven bishops and some hundreds of clergy declined to swear allegiance to William and Mary brought about their ejection from office, and in face of this body of High Church nonjurors, the Government felt it unwise to revert to the Convention Parliament plan of limited episcopacy, and contented itself with legalizing a plan like Charles's Declaration—suspending the penal laws on condition certain oaths were taken. The Act of Uniformity was not varied, the system was rounded off by stipulating presently that the sovereign, supreme governor of the Church of England, must be a member of that Church, and so Puritans were definitely shut out of the Establishment in every part.

But whereas the proscription of Catholics was continued and intensified, the Puritans had their lot ameliorated, and their position legalized. Deprived of certain civil rights, compelled to contribute to support an Establishment on lines to which they objected, they

yet were entitled to exist and to manage their own ecclesiastical affairs, free from all interference. If the Presbyterians had chosen to revive the system of 1648, and organize their presbyteries and synods and national assembly, the way was open for them. The nonjurors decided, after a little hesitation, not to perpetuate a line of bishops and clergy who were excluded from the national churches ; and considering that the whole of the great Jacobite party lay behind them, they showed great self-abnegation. But the principles of the Presbyterians might well have led them to organize, encouraged by the example of Scotland ; and that they refrained goes far to show that their vitality was impaired by the persecution. As for Independents, Baptists, and Friends, they now had all they ever sought in the religious field, the right to do what they believed was due to God, exempt from all State control. By degrees the Presbyterians slowly crumbled away, some causes dying out, others in practice becoming Independent, and others being affected by a new and serious tendency towards Socinianism.

The Church of England in 1689 attained a settlement after one hundred and thirty years of intestine conflict, substantially on the lines laid down by Queen Elizabeth. Three great parties had been expelled in succession : those who held to the Church of Rome, those who followed the Reformed type, those who could not lightly abjure their oath even to a Roman Catholic king. With three great bodies of men alongside the Established Church, all alike in that they stood aloof from her on conscientious grounds, the tone of ecclesiastical life within her ranks was probably at the lowest to which it ever sank. And to this fact we must attach weight when we study the rapid degeneracy of the next age and the inroads of Deism and Atheism.

II. PURITANISM FREE TO WORK OUT ITS DESTINY

The English colonies afforded an open field where the arm of Parliament and the bishops hardly availed to check a free development. At a very early stage this was realized, and, under James I, Puritan settlements were

made in Bermuda and Virginia. The Indian massacre ended the experiment in Virginia, and new colonists proved to be heartily attached to the episcopal system. But a little colony of Brownists, chiefly from Notts, but reinforced at Leyden by others, proved that on the inhospitable shores north of Cape Cod existence was possible, and soon a great Puritan emigration was promoted by men of wealth and station. Previous settlements were bought out or absorbed, a charter was obtained for the self-government of a trading company, and with the head quarters of the company shifted to Boston, emigration prospered till perhaps some forty thousand picked colonists of the Puritan type were creating a New England on the Atlantic seaboard.

At an early stage the liturgy was disused, and a few who desired it were shipped back again. Each little township organized itself, and there appeared a great unanimity in the ecclesiastical ideals of the colonists. Every town had its Church ; the membership of this was voluntary, but the civil franchise of the town was limited to the Church members.

Within the Church all affairs were administered by the minister and elders, but consociations of the ministers met to consult and to advise a Church when in special difficulty. Such were the general features of the 'New England Way,' but two tendencies disclosed themselves. Massachusetts remained on the oligarchic principle, and the Churches held aloof one from another; Connecticut was more democratic in management, and in the 'Saybrook platform' adopted more Presbyterian methods of linking the Churches. Each colony founded a college, and both Harvard and Yale attest the Puritan pride in learning.

The original Plymouth colony was engulfed in Massachusetts, and its different ecclesiastical traditions faded away. But while the Puritans sternly refused to tolerate Episcopalians, Baptists, or Friends, Roger Williams and Clark secured charters for the little colony of Rhode Island which made it, first of all these lands, the home of religious liberty; in practice it became a stronghold of the Baptists. New York and the Jerseys, absorbed from Dutch and Swedes, proved a

congenial home for Presbyterians proper. William Penn gave his name to a huge grant taken in satisfaction of a royal debt, and soon the Friends and the Baptists swarmed into Pennsylvania. Lord Baltimore gave a leaven of Roman Catholicism to his colony of Maryland, while the more southerly states, though mainly settled by an episcopal squirearchy, yet attracted many French Huguenots. Thus nearly all the Atlantic coast of North America was occupied by Englishmen, and most of these were of the Puritan type, untrammelled by the English laws.

In a generation or two difficulties arose in New England as to Church membership. Children of godly parents did not always evince strong religious tendencies and were not always ready to take the rigid covenants which their fathers had entered into; yet they clung tenaciously to the Church into which their baptism had introduced them, as the only route to the civil franchise. Their children in turn, growing up with even less of parental care, were too often mere nominal members, and a cry arose for a Halfway

Covenant which should qualify them for membership of Church and State, yet should not commit them to an unreal profession. Rather than admit the Baptist contention that the purity of the Churches must be conserved at all costs, and baptism must be reserved for those who make credible profession of trust in God, the Halfway Covenant was admitted. Another generation or two, and the Churches were passing over rapidly to Unitarian views.

Then arose a great Calvinist, Jonathan Edwards of Northampton. George Whitefield from England came to add personal magnetism and unceasing labour of evangelism to the unflinching logic of the pastor. The middle of the eighteenth century saw a great revival throughout the colonies, a revival on strong Puritan lines. Socinianism was driven back, and 'Separate' Churches arose, free from the entanglement of Church and State which had wrought so much harm in New England. Most of these Churches evolved easily into Baptist Churches, and thus Puritanism obtained its foothold in the southern lands.

A few earlier colonies of Spain and France

quite failed to give any ecclesiastical tone to North America, except round Quebec and Montreal. The influence of New England, New York, and Virginia spread steadily across the continent, and has proved strong enough to assimilate all late comers. Puritanism in America has been free from legal repression, and has had to confront such fresh problems as the call to overtake a scattering population and an immigrant host, the call to confront and combat new forms of evil.

In the task of evangelization the Congregationalists of New England proved not able to cope with a new problem. They had leaned so much on the civil power that they never quite adjusted themselves to new conditions where there was no State. And so Congregationalism remains chiefly a local phenomenon of New England, where it has indeed escaped the alliance with the State, but where it has been eaten into by Unitarianism. Its glory is in the foreign field, where it rose to the occasion and sent forth abundant missionaries. But its sons inland passed over readily to Presbyterianism.

The Presbyterians, however, have shown their strength in absorbing and educating those who desire a higher culture. In the primary task of evangelizing they have found their standards of propriety, of doctrine, of education, too mature for a rapidly growing constituency; nor has their machinery always been adaptable enough for the rapid changes. Yet when it comes to coping with social evils, due perhaps to lust or greed, but assuming new and portentous forms in a new world, Presbyterianism is justified of her children. She has been abundantly helped by the successive waves of Dutch, Germans, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, all of the Reformed type.

Evangelization has fallen chiefly to Methodists and Baptists, and their advance has been phenomenal. The former represent a very modified Puritanism, of a type to be explained later; but they do insist on a mutual scrutiny and comparison of the inner life, with a view to purity. Setting aside the Roman Catholics, whose status on this continent is older than that of Protestants, and whose numbers and influence are admittedly large, then the religious

condition of North America is due to Puritanism. And it is noteworthy that while all forms of Christian Churches have had equal opportunities, only three bodies number a million communicants—Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians. Over the whole of the United States the percentage of communicants is higher than in the old land. But when we turn to the statistics of crime, of criminals undiscovered, of criminals approved by public opinion, of social wrongs not branded as crimes, we recognize that Puritanism has shown itself degenerate from its first principles. And when we see that some of these evils are tolerated even within the Churches, that multi-millionaires whose methods of acquiring their wealth shock the public conscience are yet members in full Church standing, then we recognize that Puritanism has stood too long in the old paths, and has not adjusted herself to see the needs of a changing age.

Nevertheless, we may recognize one great contribution to religious freedom. First in Rhode Island complete liberty of religion was assured; then in Virginia the battle was fought

to win it elsewhere; and from one of the Puritan bodies this principle has spread, until it was asserted in the fundamental claims of the people, and is embodied in the constitution of the United States. Though in older lands neither prosperity nor adversity made the Puritan fully realize the direct responsibility of every soul to God, yet in the newer world, with fewer controversies to cloud the air, the English Puritan set up the standard of perfect religious freedom.

VI

UNBELIEF AND APOLOGETIC

Atheism and Deism—Community of thought to replace unity of organization—Age of reason and utilitarianism (pp. 163–166).

- (i) Three schools of thought—(a) Critical—Tindal and Rousseau, Foster and Butler—Heartlessness of the Christian champions—Blount's insinuations—Toland, Lardner, Semler and Tübingen—German rationalism—Chubb's simplification of the Gospel—Woolston and Strauss on miracles—Sherlock's forensic reply—Leslie's Short Method (pp. 166–178); (b) Rationalist—Descartes and Spinoza—Locke on the Reasonableness of Christianity (pp. 179–183); (c) Platonist—Whichcote—Cudworth (pp. 183–186).
- (ii) Four lines of result—(a) Hume the sceptic—(b) Clergy—Best expelled—Swift the wit—Tillotson the plain—Butler the logician—(c) Statesmen—Bolingbroke the Erastian—Walpole the conservative—(d) The Masses—Smollett—Irreligion—Need of a new departure (pp. 187–192).

LECTURE VI

UNBELIEF AND APOLOGETIC

OVER all religious life, whether within or without the Established Church, there spread a blight, which ravaged England from 1670 to 1750. The fierce conflict of parties, the intolerance too often shown by the temporary victor, disposed men to look askance at religion itself, in whose name the conflict was waged. There was, therefore, a reaction which for a brief moment assumed the form of Atheism. Against this Robert Boyle founded a series of lectures, in true Puritan style, directed expressly to exhibiting the evidences of the faith. His trustees were fortunate in obtaining an able lecturer to begin, and Bentley was wont to boast that he had compelled Atheism to withdraw from the open field, and to masquerade in future as Deism.

If we try to understand the deistic movement not from the outside, but from within Christian circles, we may view it as an unconscious confession that the policy of comprehension had failed, as an attempt to devise a new treaty of peace between rival parties. The bounds of the Church of England were now set, and within her pale there was no room for many whose piety could not be disputed; but at least there might be interchange of views and approximation in thought. Formal union was impossible, but some common ground might be acknowledged. An obvious danger in this tendency was to widen the circle of those who agreed, by narrowing the topics to be taken into account, to jettison one doctrine after another in the hope of uniting all men of good sense.

Two bishops will serve to illustrate briefly two aspects of this movement. Croft of Hereford, so faithful in his dealing with King Charles, sought diligently some accommodation with others. The very title, 'The Naked Truth,' suggests that he was prepared to discard much of the conventional trappings of

truth. As a matter of fact, in ritual he was prepared to see much variety, and in doctrine would be content with adhesion to the Apostles' Creed. Forty years later Bishop Hoadley spoke in the same sense, and pleaded for liberty of conscience; but this raised such a turmoil that peace could only be restored by the drastic measure of suspending Convocation. A typical utterance was made in a sermon at Windsor: 'Faith, Truth, and Grace are the three great impostors of the world. Reason is the empress of the soul, whose conduct through theology, morality, and policy I am now to show you.' It is refreshing to know that King Charles declared it stuff, and said it were better to tell how to live well and die well; yet even in this royal programme is a sign of the lessening of interest in theology.

In every department of life a change was evident: art was giving way to science; no longer the portraits of Vandyck or the cartoons of Raphael, but the telescope of Newton and the barometer of Boyle were typical. Utilitarianism was a mark of the age, and therefore not the decrees of God and other knotty

points of dogma engaged the theologian, but the everyday topic of conduct.

I. THREE SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

Despite the multitude of writers, we can discern that they fall largely into three schools. There was the Critical, springing out of the studies of Brian Walton, who popularized the lower or textual criticism in England by the publication of the London Polyglot Bible, and out of the writings of the French Catholic Richard Simon, who founded the higher or historical criticism of the scriptures. There was a Rationalist school, affiliated to the line of Bacon and Hobbes, but strengthened by foreign thinkers such as Descartes and Spinoza. There was a peculiarly English school, developed at Cambridge by study of Plato, which may be labelled Latitudinarian. One or two typical leaders in each school claim our attention.

1. *The Critical School*

The best representative of those who dealt with the historicity of the Christian facts was

Matthew Tindal, 1656–1733. Trained at Oxford, having made experience of the Roman Catholic fold, and perhaps having there come under the influence of Simon, he published in old age a book with the paradoxical title, *Christianity as Old as the Creation*. The general position of the treatise is that natural religion is perfect; that the religion of the Old Testament was really retrograde, and that the merit of primitive Christianity was to discard or oppose much of the Judaistic accretions, and so to return to the primaeval pure religion. What has subsequently gathered upon primitive Christianity is not an outgrowth, but an incrustation which needs to be removed. The strength of the book is its criticism of the Old Testament history and of the conduct of the Old Testament characters; the argument implies that Church history from apostolic days might be similarly criticized. The fundamental assumption is that primitive man had a perfect religion; herein we recognize the filiation of Rousseau from this best and loftiest of the English Deists.

The book ran through four editions in three

years, though it is but a torso ; the remainder was suppressed by Tindal's literary executor. Even as it stands, it is the ablest production of the whole school, and it called forth several champions of Christianity.

The first in the field was James Foster, a Baptist minister in London. His own summary of his argument will show the contemporary mode of thought that affected challengers and defenders alike. Treating of the advantages of a revelation, and particularly of the Christian, and of the use and evidence of miracles, he urges that 'Reason, however sufficient in itself to our moral conduct, may be grossly perverted ; and in such a state of corruption (which 'tis possible, for the very same that it may happen in any single instance, may be universal) the usefulness of a revelation will be altogether as great, as if men were unavoidably ignorant of the principles of religion and morality.' He vindicates the conduct of Providence in not making the Christian revelation universally known, and proves that this is consistent with the perfections of God, and consequently with the notion

of its being a divine revelation. He shows that we have a sufficient probability, even at this distance, of the 'authenticness, credibility, and purity' of the books of the New Testament; and that the common people are able to judge of the truth and uncorruptedness of a traditional religion. He answers the arguments drawn from the change of languages, the different use of words, the style and phrase of scripture, &c., to prove it to be an obscure, perplexed, and uncertain rule. He defends positive commands generally, and vindicates the peculiar positive institutions of Christianity.

This book also rapidly ran through three editions, and was accepted as the standard defence. But it excited, in its turn, the criticism that the author seemed to pass by some characteristic Christian doctrines in such a way as to imply that they were not fundamental. In especial he evaded any discussion of the Atonement, and his allusions to the Incarnation are meagre and unsatisfactory.

Before, however, the limitations of Foster had become generally recognized, a second champion took the field, who hardly mentioned

Tindal in his book, while providing an argument which should demolish his position. Joseph Butler is greatly indebted to Foster, but has so wrought his argument that the *Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature* has become a Christian classic. As an *argumentum ad hominem* it is irresistible ; from the premisses of the Deist the candid reasoner is led on to the Christian position. But it laid the author open to precisely the charges levelled at Foster, that he did not prove enough, and that he acknowledged only a probability rather than a demonstration. And it was not fully recognized that the recoil of the weapon was equal and opposite to the impulse of the projectile ; the argument is cogent enough, and therefore if the conclusion reached is not welcomed by the student, he is likely to accept the logic and reject the premisses. To-day in Indian colleges this is too often the result, and the Brahman Deist is not led on to Christianity, but is driven back into Atheism. At the time, however, the success of the Christian apologists was perfect, and so far as argument could

avail, the deistic movement received its death-blows here.

The movement has here been glanced at in its loftiest phase ; but it was not confined to scholarly circles, nor were the books always in the judicial spirit of these three. There were distinct appeals to the mob, and one or two of these must be noted.

At the opposite pole from Tindal is Charles Blount, 1654-93. He criticized Moses by the theories of Copernicus, and arrived at the conclusion that the Old Testament is not to be taken literally, but valued for its ethics. In the course of this examination he began the literary dissection which is so familiar in our own day when the sources of the Hexateuch are separated by the tiro. Then from another side he criticized the life and miracles of Apollonius of Tyana, and laid down principles which were only too obviously stated that the reader should apply them with destructive effect to the life and miracles of Christ.

The intention of the book was so manifest that it was suppressed as flippant. Blount arrived at the conclusion that wise men recog-

nized the errors and inconsistencies, but were silent about them, and even connived at their propagation, because they made the people more subservient to government. It was, perhaps, fortunate for the Christian cause that Blount was an early writer on the Deist side, for his underhand methods not only discredited him, but brought obloquy on the cause he was advocating. Possibly we may infer that at this stage there was a mass of public opinion on the side of Christianity—an assumption difficult to make in the later days, when Foster's first word was, 'That infidelity has increas'd among us very much of late, is a general observation,' and when Wesley was mobbed in town after town.

It has been suggested that the veiled and insinuating methods of Blount were rendered necessary by the existence of the blasphemy laws. That these were no dead letter is shown by the careers of Toland and Woolston.

John Toland was born near Londonderry, of Roman Catholic parents, in 1669. Becoming Presbyterian, he studied at Glasgow, Edinburgh, Leyden, and Oxford. In 1696 he pub-

lished *Christianity not Mystrious*, arguing that whatever was obscure in historical Christianity was due to the faulty incorporation of Levitical rites and heathen corruptions, whereas primitive Christianity and the New Testament itself were perfectly intelligible to all men whose reason was not warped by wilful misuse. He claimed that the book would win back many deists and atheists to orthodoxy, and intended to follow it up by an exposition of those parts of the New Testament esteemed mysterious, and then by a formal defence of revelation against atheists. But the first part called forth great indignation; the grand jury of Middlesex presented him, the Dublin ministers denounced him, he was prosecuted in the King's Bench, and when the Irish Parliament ordered the book to be burned and himself to be arrested, he fled to England, and dropped his project. This soured his temper and turned him to the negative side of his work. After proving in a life of Milton that *Eikon Basilike* was issued under a false name, and hinting that the same was true of many works attributed to the apostles, he opened up the

question of the canon deliberately in his *Amyntor, or a Defence of Milton's Life*. This started such men as Lardner and Semler on their researches into the history of the early Christian literature. But Toland's book was not limited simply to exposing the apocryphal nature of much of this; he sketched out a theory of history which accounted for the origin of Christianity, a theory which was taken up and elaborated by the professors at Tübingen; and his semi-philosophical remarks as to two opposing parties in the early Church leading to a mediating and reconciling party, anticipate the wider inductions of Hegel. The Convocation of Canterbury meditated proceedings against him, and though the bishops declined to take action, he was driven into more acute opposition. Thus in Old Testament criticism he maintained that the true institutions of Moses perished with him, and that the extant Levitical rules were the unauthorized product of a later age. Even in the Mosaic period he attenuated the miracles, placing upon them a naturalistic interpretation. And in his study of Church history, he

emphasized that comparison with other religions and their reaction on Christianity which initiated the contrast with Islam worked out by Paley, the tracing of the inflow of pagan Greek conceptions of which Hatch is the best modern exponent, and the whole group of studies so important to-day under the title of Comparative Religion. Travelling and residing in Holland and Germany, he started many Continental thinkers, and though his influence in Britain may have been slight, he was the inspirer of Reimarus and the German rationalists.

Toland's appeal was to the educated classes; a glove-maker named Thomas Chubb, born near Salisbury in 1679, brought the whole subject to the attention of the middle and lower classes. A diligent student of unblemished character, possessed of a lucid literary style and a good sense of logic, and in steady communion with the Church of England, he did much to rehabilitate the cause, and thus must be esteemed as one of the really important leaders. His most characteristic work appeared in 1739, when Foster and Butler had silenced Tindal. In *The*

True Gospel of Jesus Christ he insisted on the fact that the gospel was preached to and intended for the poor, so that it must have been essentially comprehensible by an uneducated man. It was easy to pass to the position that Christianity was not doctrine, but life; and to point out that the teaching of our Lord recapitulated much that was in the Old Testament and even in earlier heathen moralists. Hence he inferred that the true gospel was practically identical with natural religion, and that what our Lord had done was chiefly to purify this from the current misconceptions and to reiterate it in its simplicity. Once started it was self-supporting, and needed no witness from prophecy or miracle. The reflections of evangelists and apostles had no authority, and really diverted attention from the necessity of living according to our Lord's precepts.

Another phase of the controversy was initiated by Anthony Collins in two bitter books. The second of these, in 1724, dealt with the argument from prophecy in the Old Testament, and held that this did not apply literally to

our Lord, only allegorically. The ensuing debate called into the field Thomas Woolston, who for twenty years had been preaching Origen's principles of allegory. With Collins he admitted this method of using prophecy, against him he held that the proof on these lines of Christ's mission was adequate. But he then went on to examine the companion argument from miracles, and applied the same principles, concluding that the records are not literally true, but only allegorize certain spiritual truths. This promptly entailed a prosecution for blasphemy, and when he followed up the *Moderator* with a series of six *Discourses*, examining in detail all the miracles, the prosecution was pushed to an issue, and he was thrown into prison, where he died in 1731. The sale of his books, however, did not stop, and it is said that 30,000 copies were sold. On the Continent his principles were taken up by German scholars, of whom at last Strauss presented the most finished exposition of his theories. The best antidote in England was provided by Sherlock, who struck out a new line in applying legal principles of proof,

cross-examining the apostles and evangelists, establishing their credibility and their intention to narrate plain facts. While a few theologians disliked the method, it proved amazingly popular, running through thirteen editions in twenty-six years, setting a model that Paley did not disdain to follow, and still commanding the attention of lawyers.

As the whole matter had been brought into the popular arena, there was a demand not only for the solid contributions of Lardner, Sherlock, West and Butler, but also for some compact little tract. Such was produced in 1696 by a nonjuror, Charles Leslie. His *Short and Easy Method with the Deists* was to lay down rules for testing allegations of fact, viz. that the matter be such as that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it; that it be done publicly in the face of the world; that not only public monuments be kept up in memory of it, but some outward actions were to be performed; that such monuments and such actions or observances be instituted and do commence from the time that the matter of fact be done. He then

showed that these rules did hold in the cases of Moses and Christ, and did not hold in the case of Mahomet and others brought forward.

With all these men, the arguments were chiefly historical, and the philosophical pre-suppositions were taken for granted. Two schools of thinkers were busy in the arsenals behind these combatants, and they must be studied.

2. *The Rationalist School*

The philosophic movement inaugurated by Bacon had started the thinking of Descartes, although his education had been received from the Jesuits. Approaching the problems of thought from the side of mathematics, he demanded exact proof of every thesis, and systematically doubted every proposition till it was justified by reason. The fundamental truth that he accepted was that of his own existence, established by his power of thought—*cogito, ergo sum*. Such knowledge, then, as the mind gets direct is of the highest certainty. But knowledge acquired through history, contingent fact, can only be

secondary and dubious ; all positive dogma, therefore, must not be ranked as true science. Applying these conceptions to anthropology, he defined the soul by thought, the body by extension, and regarded all else as deduction, in whose processes error was likely to enter. Applying the conceptions to theology, he argued that the very ability we have to frame the Perfect Idea proves that it must necessarily be realized ; comparing with the fact of our own existence, we verify the existence of God.

The next great thinker of this school was Benedict Spinoza, a Portuguese Jew, also resident in Holland, where he supported himself as an optician. He entered literature as an exponent of Descartes, but in 1670 issued a *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*. He defended liberty of conscience—denied him by his own kindred—restricting the functions of the State to the actions of men, not their opinions ; theology is made the handmaid of the State in the formation of character, but is denied any theoretical value. Philosophy, then, is supreme in this field ; the human attributes given to God in scripture are ruled

out as merely relative, while it is admitted that as value-judgements they may be useful in commending justice, love, &c. The more positive side of his teaching came out in his *Ethics*, published soon after his death in 1677. This he summarizes thus: 'By substance I understand that which is in itself, and which is conceived in itself . . . there is but one substance, which is identical with God. We cannot predicate anything of it.' It is needless to follow up his exposition of Stoicism, modernized, for his influence on the deistic movement was through an Englishman.

When John Locke suspended his connexion with Shaftesbury in 1675, and went to France and Holland, he entered on a literary career in 1686, after the opportunity of studying Hobbes's doctrine of sense-perception as well as developing the theories of Descartes and Spinoza. His *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* stated principles which he directly applied to this controversy in a paper on the *Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures*. His line was to examine the mind ; his conclusion was that we have no

innate ideas, all are experimental, gained through sensation and reflexion. He tested Lord Herbert's five axioms: that God exists, that worship is imperative, that there is an eternal distinction between virtue and vice, that repentance is possible and can avail in reformation, that there is a final issue in rewards or punishments. The only one he allowed was the existence of God; he defined goodness as a conformity to God's will, a point examined presently by Cudworth; the connexion between virtue and happiness he traced to God, but he did not say whether the connexion was arbitrary, a point expanded later by Paley. When we observe that his essay on the *Reasonableness of Christianity* appeared in 1695, although it may have been designed to promote a union of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, yet it is clear that this, as well as the works of Toland and Chubb, were the natural corollaries to his great *Essay*. And thus he became involved in a controversy with Stillingfleet for the next four years. Nor is it surprising to learn that Anthony Collins was a direct disciple.

The key-note to all this philosophy was the assertion of the thorough competence of reason to solve all problems. And it is hardly too much to say that Locke is responsible for the trend of theological thought during all the eighteenth century.

3. *The Platonist School*

There was for a time one group of thinkers who stemmed the tide, and though their influence hardly passed to the Continent, yet within the four seas the Cambridge Platonists deserve notice. They sprang from the very heart of Puritanism, at Cambridge, and even at Emmanuel, in the height of the Commonwealth, there took shape a reaction against the Puritan thought.

We may pass Chillingworth, with his motto that the Bible and the Bible only was the religion of Protestants, to look at the leader, Benjamin Whichcote. Appointed lecturer at Trinity Church, and then Provost of King's College, he held for sixteen years a position of the first importance, and became the guide of all the rising thought of Cambridge.

The reaction at the Restoration sent many of his pupils into obscurity, but some at least saw their way to conform and so perpetuate his tradition for a generation. Thomas Goodwin the Independent, President of Magdalen College at Oxford, was horrified to find 'such corrupt preachers and preaching' as he found Whichcote giving and inspiring. The Master of Emmanuel was grieved to find that mind and understanding were exalted above heart and will; that the doctrine of decrees was not dwelt upon, but that God's goodness was emphasized more than His sovereignty; that the doctrines of original sin and total depravity were taught less than the inherent likeness of man to God and his capability of renewing that image. Whichcote himself thought that there were few vital doctrines, and though he gave full due to reason in apprehending them, it was because he extolled this as the very voice of God.

Of his pupils it must suffice to mention John Smith the preacher, and Henry More the mystic. Edward Stillingfleet is better known, both for his attempts to promote peace

in 1661 and for his championship of Protestantism under Charles and James ; but though he rose to be Bishop of Worcester, and wrote on most of the topics of the time, he failed to make any lasting mark. Of the whole band, the most learned and philosophical was Ralph Cudworth, Master of Clare Hall and then of Christ's College. His great work appeared in 1678, setting forth *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* as against Atheism. He held substantially a doctrine of the Inner Light, and devoted much trouble to show how even the heathen had a knowledge of God which was mainly correct. Two of his most interesting criticisms were on Hobbes, setting forth, instead of the doctrine in *Leviathan*, a spiritual philosophy ; and on Locke. Of that philosopher, whose declining years were soothed by Cudworth's daughter, he asked what it meant to say that God was good, if goodness was defined as being conformity to God's will ? Unfortunately, Cudworth was deterred from publishing the rest of his system, and his literary executors delayed far too long, so that really the influence of the Platonists

died rapidly, and left simply the commonplace philosophy of Locke to hold the field.

The question which lay at the root of all these debates was in reality, What is the basis of revelation? The voice of authority had been disregarded from the time of the breach with the old order; the Lutheran view that scripture was self-evidencing had hardly satisfied any English minds, except in the modified form wherein Calvin presented it, and with the decay of his influence this lost ground; the mystic reliance on the Inner Light, despite its antiquity and its Platonic adherents, seemed too discredited by the extravagances of the Friends; thus the only alternative appeared to be reliance on the common sense of mankind, as distinct from the particular sense of the individual. And thus the general trend was to Rationalism, and the age was predominantly one of reason. It remains to trace the result in the religious life.

II. FOUR LINES OF RESULT

To estimate this, we may look at three influential classes, and at the great mass of the people.

1. *Minimizing Philosophers*

Professional thinkers found that the tendency to surrender point after point of the Christian faith was accelerating. Whitby, who began as a Protestant reconciler, passed through mere Protestantism and Arminianism to Arianism. Whiston, like his predecessor Newton, diverged from mathematics to theology, openly advocated Arian and Millenarian views, and at last organized a sect whose sole congregation met in his home. These men had practically no followers, but David Hume brought the process to its logical issue in a general scepticism which indicated the need for a completely new departure in philosophy.

2. *Clerical Circles*

Closet students might possibly be passed by as unimportant, but the regular open teachers of the populace were bound to have power. It was most unfortunate that many of the most conscientious men were driven from the parish pulpits in 1662 and 1690, and so could sway only select congregations. The piety of Watts and of Ken might affect nonconformists

and nonjurors, but they were as lights shining only under a bed or within a bushel. When we look at the ecclesiastics who climbed the ladder of State preferment and shone from loftier altitudes, the quality of their light is disappointing.

The man most akin to the Puritans was Robert South, a staunch Calvinist, who refused bishoprics from five sovereigns, and who stands out as the most noted preacher of the Caroline age. But however pure his doctrine, however rigid his logic, however fervid his oratory, an unrestrained gift of humour went far to nullify these advantages. This tendency, as displayed by Swift, was not coupled with the merits that excuse South, while the dubious nature of his relations with women, the undisguised indecency of his verse, and the scurrility of his prose can only excite deep pain that such a man could climb even to a deanery. Except for a dozen sermons, which he owned were political pamphlets, the writings that have most bearing on our theme are three. But the *Tale of a Tub* in its criticism of Romanism goes on principles

that undermine all religion, and thus raised doubts as to his Christianity, effectually blocking his promotion. Nor can we balance this by his anti-deistic satires of later years, for however amusing they are they quite failed to silence Toland and Collins, or even laugh them out of court.

More pleasant is it to look at Tillotson, of the Platonist school. His strong common-sense, his unvarnished language and his straightforward style made him an acceptable preacher, while his Erastian principles facilitated his succession to the primacy. He was perhaps a typical prelate of the age.

The best type was Joseph Butler. But all his wealth of closely knit argument did not avail even to produce in his own mind any conviction of God's love or of his own salvation, as is shown by the well-known colloquy with his chaplain on his death-bed. He is a fitting representative of the age that inaugurated the Boyle and the Bampton lectures.

3. *Governing Classes*

To note the effect among men of action, we need only glance at two prime ministers.

Bolingbroke anticipated Gibbon in his view that religion was a convenient handmaid to the State. He was ever ready to discuss theology, whether with the pious Countess of Huntingdon, or with the wits at his table, when he had Greek Testaments served round with the wine as the staple of the last course. Between him and Voltaire was a natural affinity, and with his death in 1751 the whole deistic movement came to a full close. When his works were published, three years later, they proved unsaleable ; the tide had turned.

If we look to his successful rival, Walpole, we find instead of King Stork, King Log. His leading idea was to change as little as possible. 'Above all, no enthusiasm' might have been his motto had he had the wit to coin it. He may have feared that the whole fabric of the State Church, if not of religion itself, was so shaky that any attempt to mend it might result in its falling to pieces. The timid apathy with which he perpetuated evils which he acknowledged, appears quite in keeping with the appeal to the 'common sense' of that age.

4. *The Masses*

What was the sense of the commonalty? It degenerated into brutality. In the country the rectors were too often non-resident, and the people were left unshepherded. New industrial towns arose and no steps were taken by the Church of England to meet the changing conditions. In town and country alike religion was ebbing fast. Readers of Defoe, Richardson, Fielding and Smollett can see the degradation of the age. And so hopeless did the prospect appear to those of the old school, that Butler himself declined the primacy in 1747, saying that he would not be further involved with a falling Church.

Theology had been minimized, on the plea of attending to ethics; but ethics had degenerated. It was forgotten that the apostles had based their advice on their teaching, and their teaching on the person and work of the Lord. The Deists might have recognized that Stoicism, even with Marcus Aurelius, had succumbed before a full-blooded Christianity.

The time was ripe in England for a new

force, and it evinced itself in a recurrence to apostolic ideals, which regenerated conduct by direct evangelistic appeals and by a frank preaching of Jesus Christ as the Eternal Word, become incarnate in order to atone for the sin of the world.

VII
THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL

- (i) The moral tone of the age as reflected e.g. in the character of public men (pp. 195-197).
- (ii) General deadness of religion in England, due to (a) Negative philosophy ; (b) Political sycophancy of the clergy ; (c) Doctrinal controversy ; (d) Sheer weariness over the religious warfare of the seventeenth century (pp. 197-201).
- (iii) Home conditions of the Wesleys—John Wesley's early life—Charles Wesley—George Whitefield (pp. 201-205).
- (iv) The crisis of May 1738—The Moravians—Surrender of scruples as to open-air preaching and lay-preaching (pp. 205-209).
- (v) 'John Wesley, Evangelist'—expresses the essence of the movement—Unceasing itineration—The 'Bristol plan' as a means of safeguarding results (pp. 209-211).
- (vi) The field—Opposition from clergy, magistracy, and mob (pp. 211-216).
- (vii) The organization of the Societies—Reluctant separation from the Church—The act of ordination (pp. 216-224).

LECTURE VII

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL

IN dealing with the great religious movement of the eighteenth century it is necessary to maintain the distinction between the Revival and its later developments ; between Methodists and Methodism as a polity. With the latter we have nothing to do in this lecture : the former constitutes an integral factor in the history of religion in Europe and in the world.

The England of the first two Georges has often been described as rotten to the core ; depraved and destitute of any redeeming feature. Without fully endorsing so sweeping a condemnation or denying elements of nobility in the public and private life of the time, one is bound to admit that it must be reckoned among the dark periods of our national history. In the first place, political corruption was

rampant; and Walpole, who was the outstanding figure of the time, organized it into a system. Even George III, in many respects so far above his predecessors in character, was tainted with the same vice; and his correspondence with Lord Bute reveals him unblushingly instructing his minister as to how to put pressure on individual politicians so as to bring them into conformity with the royal desire. In the second place, the level of morality among public men, as reflected in the correspondence of the period, was deplorably low. Junius, whoever he was, gives a picture of the Duke of Grafton which makes it hard to realize that such a man was ever entrusted with the responsibilities of public office; and although Junius wrote with a pen dipped in gall and vinegar there is no reason to believe that he did any injustice to his Grace in respect of his private life. And the worst of it all was that public sentiment was so little alive to the incongruity. In all periods there have been those in high places—one here and one there—whose characters have been impugned by rumour or by evidence:

but public opinion has made such a position increasingly untenable, until now an outward conformity to moral rectitude is a *sine qua non* for political success. What brands the eighteenth century as an age of low tone is not merely that a Duke of Grafton could be Prime Minister, but that the nation as a whole did not seem to think him disqualified for the office by his moral shortcomings.

But, it will be asked, what about religion? How was it that the religious forces of the time failed so completely to check the tide of evil? The answer must be given, regrettably but emphatically, that where it was not dead it was impotent. Bishop Butler, in his charge to the clergy of the Diocese of Durham, in 1751, refers to 'the general decay of religion in this nation which is now observed by every one'; and Lecky goes so far as to declare that 'beyond a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity and a general acknowledgement of the veracity of the gospel narratives, the divines of that day taught little which might not have been taught by the disciples of Socrates or the followers of Confucius.' This lamentable state

of things was largely the result of demoralizing association with the peculiar politics of the day. As Canon Overton pungently expresses it: 'Politics have constantly been the bane of Church life, and never more so than in the reign of Queen Anne. Many of the so-called Church questions which violently agitated men's minds were really far more of a political than an ecclesiastical character. The fact is that though it is exceedingly doubtful whether the State was of much use to the Church, there is no doubt that the Church was of very great use to the State: it was a name to conjure with and it was used accordingly.' Hence came the servile and time-serving disposition which finds adequate representation in the declaration of Porteus—afterwards elevated to the Episcopal bench—concerning George II, that 'Earth was not good enough for him, and his only place was heaven!' Carlyle's caustic indictment of the Church of the period: 'Soul extinct: stomach well alive!'—has only too much truth in it.

Dissent, on the other hand, though not tempted to worldliness, was little more useful

if at all, owing to the fact that it was blighted by ultra-Calvinism in some quarters, enervated by Unitarianism in others, and paralysed by controversy in all. The controversial spirit, it may be noted in passing, operated against the efficiency of Dissent in two different ways. While on the one hand it absorbed the energies and blunted the spirituality of the combatants, it also repelled the public, for the controversies and discussions of the seventeenth century had induced a great weariness and a great disgust; and the disputants of the following century found no large audience eager to listen to their wrangles. As a national force working for righteousness, Dissent must be acknowledged to have suffered an eclipse during the period in question. Full allowance, however, must be made for exceptions to this general estimate. Just as there was an Obadiah in the court of Ahab, and as there were saints in Caesar's household, so there were those who in this period of deadness worked and watched for better times. The 'Religious Societies,' for instance, were to the Revival what the Spiritual Associations were

to the Reformation. They were in full connexion with the Church of England; and their purpose, as set forth in an *Apologia* to the Bishop of London, 'was to quicken each other's affections towards spiritual things, and to advance their preparations for another world: and to this end to assist each other to live in all respects as it becometh the gospel. And that they desired to prosecute this Christian design in none but Christian methods, with due respect to their superiors in Church and State, and without any cause of offence to any one.' But these societies only covered a small area, and were for the most part confined to London.

Thus it was that at a time when moral and political corruption were rife; when social discontent was beginning to work among the newly-gathered populations of the towns; when religious influences had lost their power to shape and correct life;—at that critical juncture there was sent by God a prophet of righteousness who by his own efforts and those of the men whom he gathered round him changed the face of the country and saved

England from a revolution such as was maturing on the other side of the Channel; and saved it by the infusion of faith and the awakening of the sense of sin.

So much has been written from various quarters concerning the family history of the Wesleys that little need be said here. That history was certainly not lacking in individuality and in piquancy. John Wesley was the fifteenth child of a mother who was a twenty-fifth child: this meant a fine school of management and economy, which bore fruit in the later career of the evangelist. But the mother of the Wesleys was not only a capable housewife; she was a conspicuous saint. She was the daughter of Dr. Annesley, one of the ejected ministers of 1662; and her precocity is evidenced by the fact that at the age of thirteen she came to the conclusion that her father's views were wrong. This conclusion doubtless affected her political leanings; for she adhered to the Stuarts while her husband—a most trying person, of high character but equal irascibility—defended the Revolution settlement. Southey tells us that a year

before the death of William III, Samuel Wesley discovered that his wife did not say 'Amen' to his prayers for the King; and, on being questioned, she admitted that her king lived over the water. 'Sukie,' he said in his lordly manner, 'if we are to have two kings we must have two beds'; and he rode away, to have—according to Southey—no dealings with this independent spouse of his until William solved the difficulty by his death. When we remember these family traits we cannot feel altogether surprised at the masterfulness of their distinguished son.

In 1720 John Wesley entered Christ Church, Oxford, with a Charterhouse scholarship; and five years later he was Fellow of Lincoln and in Holy Orders. After six years in Oxford he left to take up a curacy under his father at Epworth, returning for another six years in 1729. How far Oxford was a formative influence in his character it is hard to say: but the conventional references to the subject unquestionably suggest more than we are warranted in believing. The Oxford of the eighteenth century did not deal in those wares

—to any appreciable extent—which made John Wesley rich towards both God and man: and as to the general spirit of the university we cannot forget Gibbon's biting reference to his own tutor, who 'remembered that he had a salary to receive, and forgot he had a duty to perform.' From his university experience John Wesley unquestionably profited in respect of status and scholarship: but one may hesitate to put down Oxford as among the formative influences of his life. The life of the Holy Club, which certainly exercised a powerful influence over him, was altogether extraneous; and so far from being in any sense academic, it was *in* Oxford but not *of* it. His two years in Georgia were educational and fruitful, though not immediately so. Probably it is not overstating the case to say that his failure in Georgia brought him to that conviction of spiritual bankruptcy which made him ready for the gracious experiences which were to be his so soon after his return.

Before we turn to the consideration of those experiences, which were to alter the whole current of his life, we must pause to glance at

his two first associates—his brother Charles and George Whitefield. Charles Wesley was the first Oxford Methodist, and there is a danger lest the part which he took in the earlier stages of the Revival should not be duly recognized. From first to last he was a strong Churchman; and many of his brother's acts were a sore trial to him: though when the sacraments came to be administered in unconsecrated buildings, it was Charles and not John who first made this significant departure. His marriage made evangelistic itinerancy impossible: and the fact that he thus viewed the movement from afar, rather than from the thick of the fray, caused him to see more of the breaches of order and feel less of the thrill of spiritual victory; and we are left with the feeling that he was a disappointed man. But, nevertheless, he has an abiding place in the spiritual history of the world by virtue of his genius as a hymn-writer. There will always be an element of doubt as to the relative share of the two brothers in the hymns bearing the Wesley name; but although we must be prepared to assign to John Wesley a larger

share than has been assigned to him heretofore, Charles was unquestionably the most remarkable hymn-writer in the Church's history.

George Whitefield had few of the initial advantages enjoyed by the Wesleys, having been a servant at an inn prior to entering Oxford as a poor scholar. But his amazing gift of eloquence soon won him a hearing; and it continued to render him acceptable where his companions had been silenced and rejected. His Calvinistic views separated him from the Wesleys, and for a time the feeling ran very high, though, as is usually the case, it was more bitter between the followers than the leaders. But Whitefield's concentration of effort upon preaching caused his work to be less permanent than that of John Wesley, who organized his conquests on an abiding basis; and therefore he counts for less in a survey of the Evangelical Revival.

It was to the Moravians that John Wesley owed his entrance into the full enjoyment of the Christian faith: and his separation from them subsequently on the ground of the anti-

nomian tendencies of some of their teachers must not make us forget the greatness of the debt he owed them. He had met them on his Georgian expedition, and as he watched their quiet confidence amid ocean tempests he realized that they possessed a secret which he would fain learn. It was through the ministry of Peter Böhler, a Moravian minister whom he met on his return from Georgia, that John Wesley was led to see his need of saving faith. How he went 'very unwillingly' to a Society meeting in Aldersgate Street; how he heard one reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans; how he 'felt his heart strangely warmed' as he heard concerning the change worked in the heart through faith in Christ: these and many other words like unto them are to be read in his own Journals, where he lays bare the thoughts of his own heart.

One thus awakened could hardly remain in the academic seclusion of Oxford. He must go forth and tell the world at large of the experience which he had found for himself, and which he would fain share with others.

It was no new doctrine. He was not deviating from the strict truth when he said: 'I simply teach the plain old religion of the Church of England . . . the common fundamental teaching of Christianity.' There was not even a new perspective; but there was a new earnestness, a new note of conviction which gave to the old message a dynamic force that made it essentially new.

In the interests of the work which he felt to be laid upon his heart many a scruple and preconceived idea had to be surrendered. The first to go was his prejudice against preaching elsewhere than in buildings set apart for the purpose. Writing in his Journal under date March 31, 1739, he says: 'In the evening I reached Bristol and met Mr. Whitefield there. I could scarce reconcile myself at first to this strange way of preaching in the fields, of which he set me an example on Sunday; having been all my life (till very lately) so tenacious of every point relating to decency and order that I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin if it had not been done in a church.' But what was he to do?

Not only were the pulpits of the Church of England closed to him one after the other, but the very people whom he longed to reach were never to be found within the walls of a church. He had, therefore, to choose between surrendering his prejudice or surrendering what he believed to be a divine commission to preach the gospel to the outcast. As to his duty he never wavered. Under April 2 we read: 'At four in the afternoon I submitted to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation, speaking from a little eminence in a ground adjoining to the city to about three thousand people.'

His aversion to lay-preaching followed suit. When he was in the north he heard that Thomas Maxfield, one of his helpers, had taken to preaching. He hurried home, determined to put an end to such irregularities; but his mother's warning arrested him. 'Examine,' said she, 'what have been the fruits of his preaching, and hear him for yourself.' He did so, and his comment is: 'It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good.' At a later period other deep-rooted prejudices

and preconceived ideas were similarly laid aside.

Wesley's method of work was that of an unceasing itineration. For a period of forty years he travelled on the average 5,000 or 6,000 miles a year, mostly on horseback, and preached 500 or 600 times a year. He crossed the Irish Channel forty-two times, sailing from Parkgate or Holyhead. The Rev. Richard Green gives in full the itinerary for certain years. In May and June 1780, when he was seventy-seven years of age, he preached at sixty-two places, ranging from Edinburgh to Sheffield, from Whitehaven to Boston. In June 1790, the year before he died, he preached in twenty-eight places, ranging from Dumfries to Hull. This itinerancy was a matter partly of choice, partly of necessity. 'I know,' he says, 'that were I to preach one whole year in one place I should preach both myself and my congregation to sleep!' Hence the itinerant system of modern Methodism.

But at best the preachers could only visit districts at comparatively rare intervals; for

they were very few in comparison with the area to be covered. Hence his plan of building up local societies for mutual edification. As has already been seen this was no new phenomenon, for religion had often been kept alive by such means before; and it carried with it no idea of separation from the Established Church. Under Wesley's hand, however, the organization became more complete and far-reaching. The Methodist class-meeting, which has played so important a part in the religious life of millions in the old world and the new, grew in the first instance out of a financial expedient. The society at Bristol being in financial difficulties, one of the members suggested that each should give a penny a week until the debt was cleared, adding, 'Let eleven of the poorest be put along with me, and if they can give anything, well, I will call on them weekly; and if they can give nothing, I will give for them as well as for myself.' This 'Bristol plan' at once suggested to Wesley the ideal method for the spiritual oversight of those converts whom he had already gathered into societies. What was

adopted as a financial expedient would work equally well for pastoral supervision, provided that the right 'leader' was selected; and thus arose the class-meeting, with its two-fold operations, spiritual and financial.

It is difficult for us to-day to see the Revival as those saw it among whom it took place. We all—of whatever Church—see Wesley as a whole, and can estimate his work as a whole. Whether deploring or rejoicing in certain developments, we see in him and his associates the force which regenerated English religion. Time—the greatest vindicator of Truth—has enabled us to see the majesty of the general outline of his work and to recognize as excrescences certain regrettable features. But could his contemporaries be expected to do the same? Surely not: for they were too near the scene of conflict to be able to take in the whole facts of the case. And for that reason less than justice has often been meted out to the enemies of the Wesleys, because they failed to recognize what is abundantly clear to every observer to-day, but was terribly perplexing a century and a half ago. Let us try

to look at the Revival with the eyes of its contemporaries.

Take the clergy first. Their attitude was deplorably hostile ; but it is our bounden duty to recognize many extenuating circumstances ; and this may be done without any depreciation of the work of the evangelists. Opposition did not come from one class of the clergy alone. The worldly-minded parson was a sadly common phenomenon in those days ; and he might be expected to resent the intrusion of outsiders who disturbed the peace of his parish by their fervent calls to a holiness of life to which he was himself an absolute stranger. But what needs to be borne in mind is that it was not only the worldly-minded among the clergy who viewed the new movement with distrust and dislike. The champion of ecclesiastical propriety and order, blameless in life and sincere in purpose, but unalterably wedded to the accepted order of things, how might he be expected to regard the open-air preaching, the lay-preaching, and the overleaping of parish boundaries ? We know how reluctantly John Wesley himself accepted some of these

irregular methods ; and his reluctance prepares us for a greater degree of misgiving upon the part of those who did not share his evangelistic passion. We see a regenerated England and an awakened Church as the fruit of his labours ; *they* saw only chaos and disorder ; and they were not wholly to blame for their attitude. The prejudices and conceptions of many generations are not easily shed ; and it is easier to regret than to wonder at the position taken up, especially when we remember that many of the helpers of the Wesleys went very far in the direction of minimizing and even deriding the ordinances and institutions of the Church, greatly to the distress of the brothers. And if the stickler for law and order was angered by breaches of accepted rules, the sensitive, spiritually-minded recluse would be shocked beyond measure at the physical accompaniments of the Revival. The entries in Wesley's Journal leave us in no doubt as to the extraordinary scenes which were frequent accompaniments of the preaching, especially in the early days. This is not the place in which to attempt a psychological

analysis of the phenomena ; it is quite sufficient to recognize that the manifestations came near to the demoniacal possession described in the Gospels, as though Satan were fighting for his kingdom against a spiritual force which he knew to be greater than his own. But how would it appear to men who had never deviated from the paths of righteousness themselves, and were in many cases ignorant of the mystery of ungodliness at work in the world ? Simply as madness ; or, at best, the dangerous result of working upon men's feelings and encouraging an enthusiasm which tended to burst all restraints. Here again it is possible for us to form a judgement on the whole facts of the case, which was denied, in the nature of the case, to those who lived on the spot. The preachers relentlessly unmasked the evil of the human heart, and we behold a great turning to the Fountain opened for sin and uncleanness ; but at the same time we see in a small minority of cases the mind unhinged by the sheer awfulness of the spectacle of impending judgement. It is part of the nemesis on a godless age that when the awakening comes it brings

with it an element of terror and panic which is not part of God's purposed programme of salvation, but which is rendered more or less inevitable by the antecedent conditions. In short, alike to the worthy and the unworthy in the ranks of the clergy, the movement seemed at best to be fraught with serious danger and regrettable disorder, at worst to be a pestilent fanaticism, subversive of religion, morality, and civic loyalty. The fact that such estimates were the prevailing ones reflects, however, more shame upon the age than upon the individuals who formed them.

If the clergy were hostile it was not to be expected that the magistrates would be favourable. Occasionally we meet with those who saw through the spitefulness or shallowness of some particular charge; but in general the magistracy viewed the new movement with dislike, partly because of the physical manifestations already referred to, partly because of the riots which so often sprang up around the preachers. Comparatively few took the pains to really investigate the charges made, or to understand the nature of the alleged offence;

and for a period of years, as a result, the preachers got scant justice. As for the masses of the people, they resented the indictment of their sins; but for the rest, they were not greatly concerned about the rights of the matter. A mob loves a riot; but if there is one type of riot which it loves more than another it is the riot to which an odour of sanctity and respectability is imparted by the patronage of the 'quality.' That being so, 'preacher-baiting' under the leadership of the parson and the allowance of the squire, was an interesting and attractive kind of sport; but let it be remembered that it was among these mobs that the greatest conquests of the gospel were made; and many a ruffian was cowed into good behaviour and then loved into conversion by that strange, magnetic little man.

We must now pass on to glance at later developments, ending eventually in separation of the Societies from the Church of England. Opinions may differ as to that separation; what concerns us here is simply the position taken up by Wesley as reflected in his writings. The question of separation was

raised very early, mainly because many of the opponents of Methodism said, with Prebendary Church, 'You are our most dangerous enemies: why do you not leave the Church of England?' And the converts of the Revival were tempted over and over again to echo 'Why not?' In the first conference, when in 1744 six clergymen of the Church of England and four lay-preachers met together to discuss the work of God committed to them, one of the questions debated was, 'Do we separate from the Church?' The answer recorded is as follows: 'We conceive not: we hold communion therewith for conscience' sake, by constantly attending both the word preached and the sacraments administered therein.' 'Is it not probable that your hearers, after your death, will be scattered into all sects and parties? or that they will form themselves into a distinct sect?' Answer: 'We are persuaded that the body of our hearers will, even after our death, remain in the Church unless they be thrust out. We believe, notwithstanding, either that they will be thrust out, or that they will leaven the whole Church.'

We do, and will do, all that we can to prevent those consequences which are supposed likely to happen after our death. But we cannot, with a good conscience, neglect the present opportunity of saving souls while we live, for fear of consequences which may possibly or probably happen after we are dead.' In 1758 John Wesley published his *Twelve Reasons against Separating from the Church of England*, in which the case is based upon expediency rather than any ruling principle of ecclesiastical polity. Charles Wesley added a postscript: 'I am quite clear that it is neither expedient nor lawful for me to separate, and I never had the least inclination or temptation so to do.'

But while John Wesley was fighting against the idea of separation, circumstances both within and without the Societies were bringing it near, whether he recognized it or not. At times it seemed as though he did not realize the inevitable issue: at others he seemed fully alive to it and determined to guard against all evil results from so momentous a departure. The refusal of the sacrament to his converts by many an incumbent was the determining

factor in the situation ; for Wesley never lost his true Churchman's reverence for sacramental observance, although he does not seem to have held concerning it any high theory. About 1778 services were being held in City Road Chapel during Church hours, and the sacraments were administered there by himself, his brother, and other ordained clergymen. Writing in 1784 he says, ' A kind of separation has already taken place, and will inevitably spread, though by slow degrees. . . . Their enemies provoke them to it, the clergy in particular, most of whom, far from thanking them for staying in the Church, use all the means in their power, fair or unfair, to drive them out of it.'

In September 1784 a memorable step was taken, which rendered separation inevitable. In that month Wesley ordained Coke as superintendent and Whatcoat and Vasey as presbyters for America. The following year, ' having, with a few select friends, weighed the matter thoroughly, I yielded to their judgement and set apart three of our well-tried preachers, John Pawson, Thomas Hanby, and Joseph

Taylor, to minister in Scotland.' In 1786 he ordained helpers for Ireland and the West Indies; and at the Manchester Conference the following year he ordained Alex. Mather as superintendent, and Thomas Rankin and Henry Moore as presbyters for England, 'to administer,' so ran the certificate, 'the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper according to the usages of the Church of England.' These developments caused acute grief to Charles Wesley, for he saw more clearly than his brother how far-reaching was the step taken; and Lord Mansfield had assured him that, from the standpoint of the law, ordination was separation. It was in reply to his brother's remonstrance that John Wesley used the well-known sentence, 'I firmly believe I am a scriptural ἐπίσκοπος as much as any man in England or in Europe: for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable which no man ever did or can prove.' We are not at all concerned here to discuss the soundness or otherwise of his position: for the verdict upon that must necessarily depend upon certain theories as to the nature

of the Christian Church. But we would maintain that his actions, interpreted by his own words, place his intentions beyond all doubt. The oft-quoted 'Korah sermon' proves nothing to the contrary. It was directed against some Irish preachers who administered sacraments without any authority. 'Where,' he cries, 'did I appoint you to do this? Nowhere at all. In doing it you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which is wholly and solely to preach the gospel.' And if it be urged, as it often has been, that Wesley's ordinations belonged to a period of senile decay, the answer is that the Korah sermon was preached in 1789, and if the one belongs to a period of senile decay, the other does also.

The truth is that Wesley was not consistent in his reasonings, but he was absolutely consistent in his subordination, throughout his career, of all things to practical necessity. In judging his work, and especially this particular phase of it, we are faced by two facts, indisputable and antithetic. The first is that John Wesley never reconciled himself to the idea of separation; much less did he desire it.

When met by it as a straightforward proposition he always repudiated it; and he never encouraged his followers to regard it as a way out of difficulty. But the second fact is that such was his emphasis upon practical considerations that, while deprecating separation, he was actually performing functions which made separation inevitable. There is something pathetic in his desperate attempts to reconcile his churchmanship with the needs of his Societies. He upbraids Asbury in the strongest terms for taking upon himself the title of bishop when co-superintendent with Coke in America, although the *thing* without the *name* had been Wesley's own appointment. As Dr. Fitchett says, 'He could do bold things, revolutionary things; but in characteristic English fashion he wanted to label them with tame and conventional phrases.' He utterly repudiates the doctrine of apostolic succession as a condition for valid ordination: but when English bishops refused to ordain his helpers this destroyer of exclusive episcopal rights only takes this function upon himself after vainly trying to secure the co-operation

of a Greek bishop, one Erasmus, residing temporarily in the country! No amount of reasoning will ever succeed in reducing Wesley's conduct on these matters to a state of level consistency. He *was* inconsistent; and nothing is gained by pretending that he was not.

'Wesley's mind on this subject,' says Fitchett, 'was a sort of palimpsest. The evangelical theory as to the Church was written large and indelibly upon it, to be read of all men. But hidden beneath and visible to those who searched, were fragments, in dim and broken syllables, of the old and renounced High Church doctrine.' The last sentence greatly overstates the facts: but the figure is not only picturesque but true: and its truth lies in its presentation of a workable hypothesis concerning the curious inconsistencies of Wesley's attitude to the Church of England.

A word must be said in closing concerning the effects of the Revival. J. R. Green's saying that the 'Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival' is true to fact in so far that the effects beyond

the borders of the Societies were incalculably great. Just as the German Reformation by sheer force of competition compelled a reformation within the Church of Rome, so the Church of England profited enormously in being stirred up to good works and fervent belief by the Societies around. Religion became a reality and a force, instead of the barren philosophy which meets us in the early years of the eighteenth century. Not only so, but morals were purified and philanthropy stimulated by the resuscitation of living faith; and it is not too much to claim that both the anti-slavery crusade on the one hand, and the Sunday School movement on the other, grew up out of soil prepared by the Evangelical Revival.

Was it final and complete? The answer will depend upon training and temperament. The very emphasis upon the evangelical to the neglect of the ecclesiastical element in religious life, which is to one its pre-eminent glory, will be to another a mark of incompleteness, if not perversity. The Oxford Movement follows the Evangelical Revival not merely in historic sequence but as an inevitable reaction.

VIII
THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

- (i) The Oxford Movement complementary to that of the Wesleys in many respects (pp. 227-8).
- (ii) Three religious types in early decades of nineteenth century ;
 - (a) The Conservative—supporting the existing order more because of distrust of change than from deep conviction.
 - (b) The Liberal—devoted to the Episcopal system, but at the same time regarding all matters of ecclesiastical organization as open questions.
 - (c) The Idealist—dominated by a sacramental conception of the Church and its ministry ; violently antagonistic to Liberalism and not satisfied with Conservatism : gained much of his power through conflict with the environment engendered by the Reform Act (pp. 228-233).
- (iii) Men of the Movement—Keble—Newman—Hurrell Froude—Palmer—Pusey (pp. 233-241).
- (iv) *Tracts for the Times*—Dr. Hampden and Subscription—Tract 90 (pp. 241-254).
- (v) The Jerusalem Bishopric and the secession of Newman (pp. 254-257).

LECTURE VIII

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

WHEN the Evangelical Revival is viewed in the light of the history of the Christian Church for the past six centuries, the conclusion is forced home that there was bound to be a reaction ; or rather a complementary movement whose emphasis would be the very antithesis of Wesley's. However great may be one's admiration for the achievements of the Revival, and however deep the sympathy with the conception of religion which dominated it, the centuries of ecclesiastical domination cannot count for nothing in our estimate of the probable development of religious life. If those centuries were over-absorbed with the institutional and the objective, the balance was to a great degree redressed by the evangelical emphasis of the Revival ; but it was not to be

expected that the bias of centuries would be destroyed in a few years. The Oxford Movement, therefore, was unconsciously demanded by the temperament and training of those whose religious sense did not find full satisfaction in the religious system of the Evangelicals. If there seems to be no affinity between the movements, let it be remembered that William Palmer, the contemporary chronicler of the Movement which he did much to start, recognizes in sympathetic terms their obligation to the Wesleys ; and that Dr. Pusey himself frequently refers to his 'love for the Evangelicals,' which he retained apparently to the end. It may be due to this relationship that a later generation has witnessed the disciples of the Oxford Movement filled with passion for the salvation of the outsider, proving thereby their place among the heirs of the purpose, though not of the views and methods, of the men of the Revival.

There are three possible attitudes towards a Church on the part of those within its borders. The first may be called, for the lack of a better term, Conservatism—the disposition of those

whose satisfaction with the accepted doctrine, worship, and polity makes them averse to the very thought of change. At this time it was manifested on the one hand by those whose religious sense had been quickened by the Revival, and who went back to the worship and discipline and the incomparable liturgy of the Church of England with a new heart and mind; and on the other hand by those who pay homage to religion but decline to submit to its guidance; who conform to a system which means little or nothing to them, but who fear the results of any disturbance of the existing order.

Sharply opposed to this there is Liberalism, which views all ecclesiastical organization as a matter of expediency rather than of authority and obligation—an attitude fostered by the pervasive influence of the teaching of Jeremy Bentham in the political world. Dr. Arnold was a conspicuous member of this school; and his attitude is shown by certain pamphlets which he published in 1832 for the purpose of demonstrating that Parliament could modify the Prayer-book in such a way as to bring all

denominations into harmony. In his case, as in that of many others, this disposition was combined with a warm attachment to the Church of England and the episcopal order ; but it is clear that religious Liberalism was disposed to regard many matters of doctrine and all of practice as open questions.

In the third place there is Idealism, which refuses to estimate things according to either their sentimental or their practical value ; but determines their worth by exclusive reference to a clearly defined standard. To fully appreciate the working of this school of thought it is needful to remember the large part that opportunism had played in the earlier stages of the English Reformation. The 'idealist' element makes its appearance with Hooker ; and it was upon his foundation that Laud built the superstructure which was the model to which the men of the Oxford Movement turned—men to whom rebellion against authority was as the sin of witchcraft. Their battles, therefore, against Protestantism and Liberalism were essentially one ; and as for their championship of Episcopacy, they dared

not rest it upon anything so mobile and accidental as sentiment, or mere attachment to the existing order. If Conservatism was inadequate, Liberalism was impious; and they came out into the open to fight for a position which cannot fail to command respect, whether the assumptions upon which it rests are valid or not, by virtue of the deep convictions and saintly character of the majority of its champions.

Upon these temperaments and dispositions the political environment exercised a potent influence; and it is impossible to leave it out of account in any estimate of the religious tendencies of the day. 'It was one of those periods,' says Froude, writing about his brother and his share in the Oxford Movement, 'when Conservative England had been seized with a passion for reform. Parliament was to be reformed, the municipal institutions were to be reformed; there was to be an end of monopolies and privileges. The constitution was to be cut in pieces and boiled in the Benthamite caldron, from which it was to emerge in immortal youth. In a reformed State there

needed to be a reformed Church. My brother and his friends abhorred Bentham and all his works. The Establishment in its existing state was too weak to battle with the new enemy. Protestantism was the chrysalis of Liberalism. The Church, therefore, was to be unprotestantized. The Reformation, my brother said, was a bad setting of a broken limb. The limb needed breaking a second time and then it would be equal to its business.' The new spirit found ecclesiastical expression in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829; both of which radically altered the attitude of the civil government to accepted views of religious truth. Sir Robert Peel opposed the former on the ground that the existing law had ceased to be operative, and remained therefore as only a sentimental grievance; to which Archbishop Howley replied, 'Religious tests, imposed for political purposes, must in themselves be always liable, more or less, to endanger religious sincerity'; and he was right.

But when the reforming spirit turned from

the removal of disabilities to the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, with hints as to similar methods to be applied to the English Church and a possible revision of the Book of Common Prayer, the Idealists were roused to action in defence of the eternal sacredness of the sacramental system of the Church, and especially of the sacrament of orders. 'Anything,' cried Keble in 1832, 'anything, humanly speaking, will be better for the Church than to go on in union with such a State.' From this protest of men possessed of a high ideal of the sacredness of the Church order handed down from primitive times, against the prevailing tone of the period, grew what is known as the Oxford Movement.

Newman says, in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, that he was always wont to regard John Keble's sermon before the judges on July 14, 1833, as marking the birthday of the Movement. Keble, like Pusey, but unlike Newman, had been a High Churchman from the first, and the iron entered into his soul as he watched the trend of political thought. In his Assize Sermon on National Apostasy he

asks two questions: first, what are the symptoms by which one may judge most fairly whether a nation as such is becoming alienated from God and Christ; secondly, what are the particular duties of sincere Christians whose lot is cast by divine Providence in a time of such dire calamity? He applies the teaching of Samuel's farewell message (1 Sam. viii.) to the case of a nation which, as being a Christian nation, is also part of Christ's Church, but throws off the restraint and allegiance 'on the plea that other States, as flourishing and more so in regard of wealth and dominion, do well enough without it. . . . Under the guise of charity and toleration we are come almost to this pass—that no difference in matters of faith is to disqualify for our approbation and confidence whether in public or domestic life.' Referring to the words of Jesus, 'He that heareth you heareth Me,' &c., he goes on to say, 'These words of divine truth put beyond all sophistical exception what common sense would lead us to infer, and what daily experience teaches—that disrespect to the successors of the apostles, as such, is an unquestionable

symptom of enmity to Him who gave them their commission at first, and has pledged Himself to be with them for ever.' Such words as these show clearly the conception of the Church which filled Keble's mind and shaped his actions; and he only gave expression to thoughts which were maturing in the minds of many clergy. In the summer of 1833 an 'Association of Friends of the Church' was projected; and although it never became a compact organization its advocates were responsible for a great amount of propagandist work, of which the *Tracts for the Times* were the most powerful and famous element.

If Keble first raised the issue in an imperative form, John Henry Newman stands out as the best-known figure in the Movement, partly because of the quality and scope of his writings, partly because of his distinguished career, chiefly because he has revealed for us the inner workings of his mind in the *Apologia*. He was not born a High Churchman. He refers to 'William James, then Fellow of Oriel, who about the year 1823 taught me the doctrine of apostolical succession . . . I recol-

lect being somewhat impatient of the subject at the time.' That, along with Dr. Hawkins's sermon on Tradition, was an important factor in the development of his views ; and this was not arrested by his close association with Whately for a time. In 1826 Dr. Lloyd wished him to take up the tutorship of Prince George of Cumberland. The scheme fell through because of the stipulation that the tutor should be twenty-seven years of age, and Newman was only twenty-five ; but how essentially the history of religion in England might have been altered if only Newman had been two years older ! As it was, he gave himself up to his tutorial duties at Oriel and became vicar of St. Mary's in 1828.

The name of Hurrell Froude, brother of the historian, cannot be separated from that of Newman, and had he not died, comparatively young, in 1836, he might have followed, if not preceded, Newman in his secession. A Tory High Churchman — taking sides with Becket, Laud, and the nonjurors—he was Roman in his affections and mediaeval in his interests. He was daring and even reckless in

the expression of his views, and his *Remains*, edited by Keble and Newman, was largely responsible for the obloquy which fell upon the Movement. It may be mentioned in passing that the preface, which was the most provocative element in the book, though universally attributed to Newman, was not written by him but by Keble. In the *Apologia* Newman confesses to having preached a sermon at Christmas, 1824, pointing to the Pope as Anti-Christ, and goes on to say that it was his intercourse with Hurrell Froude which led him to form a gentler view of the Church of Rome. It was in company with Froude that Newman visited Italy in 1833, and paid a visit to Monsignor Wiseman, the head of the English College at Rome. This is the account which Froude gives of the visit: 'We got introduced to him to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole. We made our approaches to the subject as delicately as we could. Our first notion was that the

terms of communion were, within certain limits, under the control of the Pope, or that in case he could not dispense solely yet at any rate the acts of one council might be rescinded by another. . . . But we found to our horror that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive council obligatory for ever; that what had been once decided could never be meddled with again' (April 13, 1833). The language there used—'dismay, horror'—very substantially discounts the editorial note: 'a jesting way of stating to a friend what really was the fact—that he and another availed themselves of the opportunity of meeting a learned Romanist to ascertain the ultimate points at issue between the Churches.' It is significant that Palmer, in his *Narrative*, condemns the note as disingenuous, and that Newman himself, in the *Apologia*, makes no reference to the queries, though he mentions the visit to Wiseman.

Reference has already been made once or twice to William Palmer, who was one of the few contemporary historians of the Movement. His *Narrative* ranks with Newman's *Apologia*,

and, to a lesser degree, with Mozley's *Reminiscences*, as constituting the consecutive record of the Movement as it is presented by those who were involved. Palmer was a man of great learning, especially in liturgiology, and Dean Church calls his *Treatise on the Church* an honour to English theology and learning. He differed from Froude and Newman in being anti-Roman, almost bitterly so; but he accepted their view of the State, and advocated positions with reference to the penalization of Dissenters to which probably no churchman to-day would assent.

On the whole, the strongest man in the party was Dr. Pusey. Less versatile and less brilliant than Newman, he was more truly learned, and he was respected for his unswerving rectitude by those who could never quite assure themselves as to the honesty of Newman. There can be no surprise that at first he was outside the party, for he was more than tainted with Liberalism. He actually conceded to Rationalists the possession of 'earnestness and love of God'—to the great horror of Bishop Blomfield, who said that such

words tended to strengthen the opinion that Rationalistic error did not affect the essence of religion ! Writing concerning the Evangelicals in his *Eirenicon* (1865) he says : ‘ Ever since I knew them I have loved those who are called Evangelicals. I loved them because they loved our Lord. I loved them for their zeal for souls. I often thought them narrow, yet I was often drawn to individuals among them more than to others who held truths in common with myself which Evangelicals did not hold, at least explicitly.’ His attitude towards Catholic Emancipation and the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was very different from that taken up by those with whom he was destined to be associated in the future. Writing to Miss Barker, afterwards his wife, in October 1827, he says : ‘ If I wished to gain a clear view of the Emancipation question I should not allow my mind to dwell on the abstract objection that a Roman Catholic must necessarily be a bad legislator for a Protestant country ; but setting out on the side on which the general truth lay, i.e. that unless there were any special objection, none should be

stigmatized for their religious opinions as unfit to be members of a legislature or be excluded from it, first consider all the arguments on this side and then weigh what might be said against it.' Writing to the same lady in the following year, he says: 'I am very anxious about the Test and Corporation Acts. I think them both in their means and their end a disgrace and a deterrent to religion. They, more than anything else, keep alive the bitterness of party spirit among Christians agreeing in the essentials of faith in England.' Pusey's accession was an enormous gain to the Movement, both because of his status as Professor of Hebrew, and because of his lofty and lovable character. But he was never altogether at one with his associates, and it is significant that the copy of the Assize Sermon which Keble sent to him was discovered by his biographers with leaves uncut. He seems to have belonged to that rare company of ecclesiastical controversialists who combine with strong convictions the grace to recognize the spiritual worth of those who differ from them.

For several years the new idealism in the

Church of England worked in the minds and hearts of individuals as a leaven, unknown or unheeded by the world at large. With the publication of the *Tracts for the Times* it 'came down from the study to the street'; and the public history of the Oxford Movement starts from that point. The tracts were written with the purpose of stimulating a higher conception of the life and ministry of the Church by building upon the apostolical succession as the one condition of a valid ministry. Out of the ninety tracts issued, over twenty dealt directly with this central position, and most of the others were concerned with subjects allied to it. The authors of the tracts were numerous and varied. Newman wrote a large proportion; Pusey wrote Nos. 18 and 67 on *Fasting*, and Nos. 77, 78 and 79 on *Baptism*; while the exhaustive treatise on *Mysticism in the Fathers* (No. 89) was Keble's work. The motto of the series was singularly appropriate: 'If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?' And certainly Newman lived up to the motto in his opening tract. 'Christ

has not left His Church without claim of its own upon the attention of men. Hard master He cannot be to bid us oppose the world, yet give us no credentials for so doing. There are some who rest their divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others who rest it upon their popularity; others on their success, and others who rest it upon their temporal distinctions. This last case has perhaps been too much our own. I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT. We have been born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives.' Whatever was the topic dealt with there was always this determination to 'maximize' the claims of religion and of the divine exponent of religion, the episcopally-governed Church.

Before passing from the early tracts a glance must be given at No. 4 (September 1833), written by Keble, because it is so frank and explicit in its reference to relations with other Christians. 'Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with this plain truth—that by separating themselves from our communion they separate themselves not only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but from the only Church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord's Body to give to His people? . . . Nor need any man be perplexed by the question sure to be presently and confidently asked, "Do you then un-Church all the Presbyterians, all Christians who have no bishops? Are they to be shut out of the Covenant for all the fruits of Christian piety which seem to have sprung up not scantily among them?" Nay; we are not judging others but deciding upon our own conduct. We in England cannot communicate with Presbyterians, as neither can we with Roman Catholics; but we do not therefore exclude either from salvation. "Necessary to salvation" and "necessary to

Church-communion" are not to be used as convertible terms.'

If the publication of the tracts constitutes the first chapter in the history of the Movement, the Hampden controversy is the second. In 1832 Dr. Hampden had been the Bampton Lecturer. Few attended any of the lectures after the first; but when they were published they were attacked as being Rationalistic, on the ground that they represented the Creeds as being based on human, and therefore uncertain, theories. This distrust of Dr. Hampden was deepened by his pamphlet in favour of abolishing subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, so as to make possible the admission of Dissenters to the university. The question of subscription played so prominent a part in the controversies of the time that we must pause to consider for a moment the arguments used on either side: for to-day the abolition seems to us so simple and ordinary a piece of justice that it is hard to realize how Oxford churchmanship could have fought so long and bitterly against it. The explanation is probably to be found in the fact that the contro-

versy involved what is also the crying question of our own day—Is definite religious belief to have a place in our educational system; and if so, under what conditions? Note the attitude of three outstanding men on the question of subscription—Gladstone, Newman, and, some years later, Maurice. Maurice defended subscription on the ground that the Articles were signed not as tests and confessions of faith but as ‘conditions of thought’—a line of argument eminently calculated to promote intellectual and practical dishonesty. Gladstone favoured the abolition of subscription, but on grounds which do not add to his reputation for straightforwardness. Writing to Pusey in April 1835, he lays down the ‘essential object’ of all university policy to be the ‘maintenance of a Church of England education,’ and he goes on to say that, granted this maintenance, it would give him ‘pleasure to see removed any subscription at entrance which is likely to form an absolute and insuperable bar to [Dissenters] becoming students in the university at a period of life when they are probably little prejudiced in favour of

Dissent, and therefore hopeful of the Church ; but yet, upon the other hand, not prepared to make an absolute renunciation of Dissent by a formal subscription.' For our own part we prefer William Palmer's unabashed plea for preferential treatment to the sneakish policy of admitting Dissenters for the deliberate purpose of drawing them away from their allegiance ! Newman argues the question on a higher ground. Writing to Percival in January 1836, he says, 'The advantage of subscription, to my mind, is its witnessing to the principle that religion is to be approached with a submission of the understanding. Nothing is so common as for young men to approach serious subjects as judges, to study them as mere sciences. The study of the evidences—such as Paley's—encourages this evil frame of mind. The learner is supposed external to the system : our Lord is "a young Galilean peasant" ; His apostles, "honest men, trustworthy witnesses," and the like. . . . In an age when this great principle is scouted, subscription to the Articles is a memento and a protest, and, again, actually does, I believe,

impress upon the minds of young men the teachable and subdued temper expected of them. They are not to reason but to obey; and this quite independently of the degree of accuracy, the wisdom, &c., of the Articles themselves.' This is not our view-point to-day, and very few would wish to safeguard religion from modern unbelief with Newman's methods; but his line of argument is altogether on a higher plane than that of Maurice with its danger of dishonesty, or that of Gladstone with its meanness.

This digression has been inevitable because the distrust of Dr. Hampden was so largely the result of his attitude to subscription. This had not taken any very definite shape when in 1834 he was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy, defeating Newman among others. Possibly the University as a whole did not think it mattered very much what a Professor of Moral Philosophy believed, or whether he believed anything at all. But when Lord Melbourne appointed him to the Regius Professorship of Divinity in 1836, a perfect storm of indignation arose. A direct protest to the

Crown failed; but after several attempts the opposition succeeded in carrying a resolution depriving the suspect theologian of his place on the Boards which appointed the select preachers before the university and which dealt with heretical teaching. On both sides feeling ran high, and men censured each other unheard because of what it was supposed their theories might lead to. If Hurrell Froude had been reckless in his advocacy of the one side, Arnold was yet more reckless—and vulgar as well—in his abusive denunciation on the other. In his article on the ‘Oxford Malignants’ (*Edinburgh Review*, April 1836), he sums up his indictment by saying: ‘In the zealots of circumcision and the ceremonies of the law; in the slanderers and persecutors of St. Paul, the doters upon old wives’ fables and endless genealogies, the men of soft words and fair speeches, of a “voluntary humility,” all the time that they were calumniating and opposing the gospel and its great apostle; in the malignant fanatics who to the number of more than forty formed a conspiracy to assassinate Paul because he denied the necessity of ceremonies

to salvation, the men of mint, anise, and cummin, who cared not for judgement, mercy, and truth ;—in these and in these alone can the party which has headed the late Oxford Conspiracy find their perfect prototype.' Which, being interpreted, means that the great and good man had lost his head !

The third epoch of the Movement commences when the trend Romewards becomes marked. As has already been pointed out, the tendency had been there from the first, and it was fostered by what Newman considered to be the rationalizing Liberalism of the Church of England, which refused to be corrected. The publication of Tract 90 (March 1841) brought matters to a crisis. It was written as an aid to those who craved the proof of antiquity and catholicity for their beliefs ; and who sought it in the Church of Rome because they could not find it in the Church of England. Newman replied that possibly that proof might not be found in the Articles as popularly understood ; but ' while our Prayer-book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also—the

offspring of an un-Catholic age—are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not un-Catholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine' (Introd. to Tract 90). In his writings at this period Newman is fond of differentiating between the 'authoritative teaching of Rome' and the 'doctrines of Trent,' which were not promulgated when the Articles were framed. Dr. Wiseman denied the existence of the difference: and, in any case, the point was so obscure as to be perfectly unintelligible to the plain man, who came therefore to the conclusion that Newman was playing with words. It must also be remembered that the word 'Catholic' was then applied exclusively—so far as ordinary, unprofessional speech was concerned—to members of the Roman Church; and consequently the utterances of the advanced party appeared to be far more revolutionary than they would seem to-day.

But unquestionably Newman was travelling fast towards Rome, whether he knew it or not. From considering Rome to be Antichrist

(1824) he came successively to see (i) that though full of faults it was neither Babylon nor Antichrist; (ii) that it was apostolic and catholic; (iii) that most of its positions could be supported by very early testimony and were unto edification; (iv) that in these respects Anglicanism was failing more and more. These movements of his mind were sensibly quickened by the action of university and ecclesiastical authorities. First came the Letter of the Four Tutors—one of whom was A. C. Tait—demanding that the name of the writer of Tract 90 should be disclosed. It was a somewhat ordinary document, but it focused the thoughts of the majority, and hence was a powerful factor in the controversy. Speaking of the tract they said, 'It has a highly dangerous tendency from its suggesting that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England: e.g. that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines of purgatory, pardons, of the worshipping and adoration of images and relics, of the invocation of saints, of the mass, as

things taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do.' How strong was the excitement is shown by the fact that the Heads of Houses refused to accede to Hawkins's very reasonable request to suspend their judgement for a week, by which time Newman's explanations would be in print; and censured the tract by nineteen votes to two. Isaac Williams, one of Newman's best allies, was candidate for the Professorship of Poetry, Keble's term having expired; but he was defeated avowedly on the ground of his Tractarian views. The bishops were almost solid in their opposition to the Oxford school, and the Bishop of Winchester went so far as to refuse to ordain Keble's curate. Pusey's sermon on 'the Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent' (May 14, 1843) was delated to the Vice-Chancellor, and he was suspended from preaching in the university for two years. The following year W. G. Ward's book on *The Ideal of the Christian Church* was condemned and the author's degrees taken

away. Most of these incidents point to sheer panic, and reflect as little credit upon the religion as upon the common sense of the champions of orthodoxy. Newman could not fail to be affected by these attacks upon the views of which he was the best-known exponent; but the severest blow to his Anglican allegiance came from outside the university. The Jerusalem Bishopric scheme counted for more than anything else. 'It brought me on,' he says, 'to the beginning of the end.' In October 1841 a plan was framed for the establishment of a Protestant Bishopric at Jerusalem, the kings of Great Britain and Prussia presenting alternately. It is easy to see that such a scheme would be abhorrent to the Oxford Catholics, on the double ground that it was intrusion into the sphere of another branch of the Catholic Church and that it involved the recognition of non-episcopal Churches and the Augsburg Confession of Faith. It finally convinced him that Catholic doctrine and practice counted for little or nothing in the Anglican Church. 'I am not at all surprised or hurt,' he writes to Pusey,

‘at persons being suspicious of my faith in the English Church. I think they have cause to do so. It would not be honest in me not to confess, when persons have a right to ask me, that I have misgivings not about her orders but about her ordinary enjoyment of the privileges they confer, while she is so separate from Christendom, so tolerant of heresy’ (August 1842). He resigned St. Mary’s in the following year, and wrote to James Mozley: ‘The truth is, I am not a good son enough of the Church of England to feel that I can in conscience hold preferment under her. I love the Church of Rome too well’ (September 1843). It was this decided trend Romewards, and particularly the secession of Seager, Pusey’s assistant lecturer in Hebrew, that led Manning to preach his violent sermon against Rome on November 5, with the result that Newman refused to see him when he called on him at Littlemore.

It was with deep agony of spirit that Newman came to the full realization of where his principles were leading him. He had long since ceased to think hardly of Rome, as we

have seen ; but he strove long against the conviction that he must leave the communion with which he had so many hallowed associations. But it was bound to come, and in the summer of 1844 he preached his last sermon as an Anglican at the anniversary of his church at Littlemore. He poured out his soul in words the pathos and eloquence of which is not dulled either by the coldness of type or the lapse of years. ‘O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them ; and bearest children, yet darest not own them ? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love ? How is it that whatever is generous in purpose and tender or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom and finds no home within thine arms ? Who hath put this note upon thee to have a miscarrying womb and dry breasts, to be strange to thine own flesh and thine eyes cruel towards thy little ones ? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou

dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent ; or thou dost loathe as an offence ; at best thou dost but endure as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them stand all the day idle as the very condition of thy bearing with them ; or thou biddest them begone where they will be more welcome ; or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof ?' Within a year the preacher was admitted into the Church of Rome, the most distinguished of many converts who travelled along the road laid down in 1833 and the following years. The Oxford Movement, as an epoch of religious history, was over.

IX

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

- (i) The Papacy during the Napoleonic era—The Concordat and the Organic Articles (pp. 261–265).
- (ii) Restoration of the Order of the Jesuits (1814) and Emancipation of the Catholics in England mark the beginning of a new state of things, despite the harassing ‘united Italy’ movement (pp. 265–269).
- (iii) Unparalleled assertiveness of Pius IX: (a) Establishment of the English Hierarchy, 1850; (b) Promulgation of Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, 1854; (c) The Syllabus, 1864; (d) The Vatican Council, 1870 (pp. 269–282).
- (iv) Modernism, the Revolt against Papal absolutism in the intellectual sphere—*Pascendi Gregis*—Acton (pp. 282–289).

LECTURE IX

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

FOR the full appreciation of the ecclesiastical developments associated with the name of Pius IX it will be necessary to travel back and review briefly the political situation. The nemesis on political activity is political penalization : and a conquering revolutionary army was scarcely likely to except the Papal States from its operations. The murder of a French general in Rome, in February 1798, gave a pretext for entrance, and the declaration of a Roman republic. The Pope was removed to a place of captivity, where he died. Rome was plundered ; and many of its treasures—amongst them Codex B—were sent to France. By the Treaty of Luneville, February 1801, Pius VII was left in possession, but only on condition that he closed his states against English goods !

During these years Napoleon—to call him by his familiar name, although at the time he was known as Bonaparte—was gathering more and more of the power of France into his own hands. With his character and his beliefs we are not concerned, except in so far as they are manifested in his dealings with the Church. He was the incarnation of the ‘self spirit’; and everything was viewed according to its capacity for ministering to his ends. In opinion he was more of a Deist than anything else; and he openly professed his sympathy with Mohammedanism. But he warmly admired the Roman Catholic system on the ground of its concentration; and he also realized how great *éclat* would be his if he figured as the restorer of altars and the nominator to bishoprics. Thus his policy towards Rome was one move in a great war-game. ‘Behave towards the Pope,’ he said to his envoy, ‘as though he were in command of 200,000 men.’

It was in this spirit that the negotiations with Pius VII were taken up. There was much procrastination and marching and counter-marching of diplomacy: but Napoleon

had the whip-hand by reason of his military power, and of the 'constitutional clergy,' dependent upon the Government for their existence, whom he could exalt at any moment at the expense of the ultramontanes. He told Gonsalvi with the utmost frankness that if Henry VIII, who had not one half of his power, could break with the Pope, he, the First Consul of France, would be well able to do without him. The outcome of these negotiations was the Concordat of July 15, 1801. By this it was agreed (i) that the Church should have freedom of worship, and while it resigned its claims to confiscated Church lands it was on the undertaking of the State to pay salaries to the bishops and clergy; (ii) that nomination of the bishops should be vested in the State, institution being conferred by the Pope; (iii) that the 'constitutional clergy' should be legitimized ecclesiastically by the celebration of canonic rites; (iv) that the patronage of parish livings should be vested in the bishops, these having been taken away from the landlords in 1790. Although the document was vague in parts—

e.g. no provision was made to meet the case of a refusal on the part of the Pope to institute a Government nominee—it healed an ugly schism and threw the clergy on to Napoleon's side. It was ratified on September 8, Napoleon reserving to himself the right 'of providing by regulation against the more serious inconveniences that might arise from a literal execution of the Concordat'—a very comprehensive rider, which in the hands of an unscrupulous man might include anything. The 'Organic Articles'—regulations dealing with a number of specific issues—were kept back by Napoleon until after the Pope had done his part. They included (i) the recognition of all religions as being on a level; (ii) the concession of liberty of conscience; (iii) the obligation imposed upon the seminaries of teaching the four Gallican Articles of 1682, viz. (*a*) the Pope has no jurisdiction over temporal sovereigns; (*b*) he is below a general council; (*c*) the Gallican liberties are sacred; (*d*) the right of judging matters of doctrine belongs to the Pope and bishops jointly. Napoleon had indeed won a complete victory,

and the Pope very rightly considered that he had been tricked ; but it is difficult to remonstrate with the victorious captain of armies. Moreover, his power of resistance was paralysed by the fact that Napoleon had most judiciously restored certain lands to him ; and had represented to the King of Naples that Benevento belonged to the Church. These territorial considerations effectually debarred the Pope from making a natural and well-deserved protest : and during the next twelve years his position was one of humiliating uncertainty and dependence. On June 10, 1809, the tricolour flag flew over the castle of St. Angelo ; on July 6 the Pope was carried off to Avignon, and remained for five years in captivity. With the overthrow of Napoleon this policy was reversed. The Pope was restored—by the non-Catholic powers of England, Prussia, Russia, and Sweden. The period of eclipse was over.

The period of aggression followed with extraordinary rapidity. First both in time and in importance—as being conducive to all that followed—came the restoration of the Jesuits

in 1814. In July 1773 Clement XIV, by the Bull *Dominus ac Redemptor*, had abolished the society. 'Inspired as we trust by the Holy Spirit; impelled by the duty of restoring concord to the Church; convinced that the Society of Jesus can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded; and moved by other reasons of prudence and State policy, which we retain concealed in our own breast, we do abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, its offices, houses, and institutions.' The reasons for this step cannot be discussed here; but the clue is partly to be found in their political machinations already referred to, partly in their widespread commercial undertakings. Their position as confessors of kings and nobles gave them extraordinary power of interference with the things of State; and they rested under numerous suspicions as to political plots and deeds of violence, which were rendered credible by their exaggerated advocacy of ecclesiastical as against civil rights. By the Bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, August 1814, they received back again their property, so far as that was possible,

and were bidden to take up their work again. 'On the stormy sea, when at every moment threatened by death and shipwreck, we should violate our duty by declining the aid of powerful and experienced mariners who offer themselves for our assistance.'

Then came the emancipation of the Catholics in 1829 in Great Britain and Ireland. It was no sudden step, neither was it complete; but it was a large instalment of a debt due both to justice and to common sense. Thirty years before (January 31, 1800) Pitt had laid before George III a document in which he expressed his own strong convictions that the conditions which had necessitated the penalization of Catholics had passed away; and that the penal legislation ought no longer to be enforced. But, however reasonable were his views, they were not destined to find acceptance. The good but very narrow-minded king conceived that it would be a breach of his coronation oath to concede emancipation, and no more could be done.

But it is with the pontificate of Pius IX (1846-78) — one of the longest and most

remarkable on record—that the aggressive policy is especially identified. His reign opens amid widespread resentment against the occupation of Italian soil by foreign troops, and also against the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, on the ground of the notoriously bad government under which the Papal States had always groaned. Out of this twofold resentment grew the passion for the unification of Italy — free alike from pope and foreigner—led by Mazzini and encouraged by the example of the French Revolution in 1848 (February). The Pope's concession of some constitutional reforms was refused ; Rossi was assassinated, and the Pope found himself driven into exile, where he remained from November 1848 to April 1850. France and Austria intervened with arms against the popular movement, which was put down for a time. It, however, regained its position under Victor Emmanuel, King of Piedmont, in whose territory the reforming tendencies were making considerable headway. In the end Rome was occupied, and the kingdom of Italy was set up with the hearty approval of the

people of Rome and of the Papal States, as is shown by the fact that in the plébiscite 133,000 votes were registered for the new order, as against 1,500.

It is hard for a Protestant to enter into the case in defence of the temporal power of the Pope, for history shows it to have been the cause of all that entanglement in political and dynastic affairs which has been the ruination of the Papacy as a purely spiritual force. The whole course of the Reformation would have been different if the Pope's relations with secular powers had been free from any *arrière pensée*, and had been ruled entirely by spiritual considerations; but history makes it clear that the Papacy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was as unblushingly secular in its aims and in its methods as any other power. There is, however, no doubt that the vast majority of Roman Catholics—with certain notable exceptions—view the retention of the states of the Church as not only a divine right, but a necessary condition for the maintenance of the independence of the Pope. It shows both deep conviction and dauntless

courage that, just at the moment when the material fortunes of the Papacy were at their lowest, Pius IX should have put forth those claims in respect of ecclesiastical and spiritual authority which rallied the Church in the hour of defeat, and enabled her to win in the field of religion that which more than compensated for what she was losing in the field of politics. We must confine our attention to four elements in this policy of aggression.

1. *The Revival of the Hierarchy in England* (1850), whereby England was formally constituted an ecclesiastical province, instead of being served by vicars-apostolic—at first four in number, then eight. In his manifesto, dated from ‘the Flaminian Gate,’ Wiseman said: ‘Your beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of the Catholic communion. Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament from which its light had long vanished; and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light and

of vigour.' When the bishops were enthroned it was declared that 'the people of England, who for so many years have been separated from the See of Rome, are about, of their own free will, to be added to the Holy Church.' It is not at all surprising that the cool arrogance of the document should have provoked a storm of indignation, and the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was passed, only to be, from the very first, a dead letter. Opinion soon settled down to regard it—as indeed Wiseman declared it to be—a purely ecclesiastical arrangement to which a reasonable Protestantism has no right to object.

2. *The Promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception* (1854). For us the importance of this step lies not so much in its doctrinal validity as in its ecclesiastical significance. It was a conspicuous victory for the Jesuits over their old rivals the Dominicans. The doctrine that the Virgin Mary was free from all original sin was one which had been contested by the latter for centuries, whereas the former had taken it under their special protection. But the importance of the step lay in the fact that the Pope promulgated the

dogma on his own authority, announcing it to a large company of bishops from all over the world as an integral portion of revealed truth. This did much to prepare the way for the promulgation of papal infallibility.

3. *The Syllabus* (1864). This outspoken manifesto to an unbelieving age was aimed directly at the aggressions of Piedmont against the temporalities of the Papacy; but its scope was not limited to the issues raised therein. To it must be conceded the credit of being the most audacious demand ever made by a party in adversity for the homage of the world at large; and its promulgation not only transcends in significance the declaration of papal infallibility, but if the claims of 1864 are conceded, those of 1870 follow. The syllabus takes the form of an indictment of certain propositions popularly held, but herein anathematized. Among these propositions are the following—

(i) That the Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have usurped the rights of princes and have erred in defining matters of faith and morals (23).

(ii) That the Church does not possess the power of coercion nor any temporal power, direct or indirect (24).

(iii) That beyond the power inherent in the episcopate any other temporal power is conferred by the civil government, either expressly or tacitly; and is capable, on that account, of being revoked by the civil government when it so desires (25).

(iv) That the decrees of Roman pontiffs contributed to the division between East and West (38).

(v) That in our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be regarded as *the one* form of religion, all other cults being excluded (77).

(vi) That for this reason in certain Catholic countries it is rightly provided by law that immigrants thither shall enjoy public exercise of their own religion (78).

(vii) That it is false to maintain that the civil liberty of any religion and the full power conceded to all of publicly expressing any opinions and thoughts, tends to the corrupting of the minds and morals of

peoples, and the spreading of the plague of indifference (79).

(viii) That the Roman pontiff can and ought to bring himself into line with progress, with Liberalism, and with modern civilization (80).

To such a pronouncement the definite promulgation of the Dogma of Infallibility was the inevitable sequel; and so we pass on to

4. *The Vatican Council* (1869). The Pope had, in his encyclical of 1846, announced his infallibility; but now he and his entourage were determined to raise the claim to the status of a dogma; and for the sake of precision it will be advisable to define infallibility at the outset. The actual phrase ran—*ab errore immunem esse Romani pontificis auctoritatem*; and the Jesuit Schrader, in his book on Roman unity, expounds the thesis as follows: ‘All Papal measures as regards their truth belong to the order of faith, or morals, or law. All decrees, whatever their subject, always contain a true doctrine, whether speculative, moral, or juridical. But the Pope is infallible in the order of truth and doctrine,

and therefore in all his decrees.' Now, although this had been claimed from time to time, it was certainly not part of the recognized framework of Romanism. For instance, in a catechism approved by the bishops and commended by Roman Catholic journals in England, the question is asked: 'Are not Catholics bound to believe that the Pope is in himself infallible?' Answer: 'This is a Protestant invention and is no article of Catholic belief. No Papal decision can bind under pain of heresy unless received and prescribed by the teaching body, the bishops of the Church.' Further, with a disingenuousness which is hard to understand and harder still to justify, Antonelli directly denied on behalf of the Pope any intention of using the council for this purpose, when all the time he knew the programme and the course which was going to be adopted. At first the hope was entertained in papal circles that, on Manning's presentation of a humble prayer to the Pope to raise the opinion of the infallibility of the Pontiff to the status of a dogma, it would be carried by acclamation. But that

was rendered impossible by the opposition of bishops from France and Germany.

Among moderates and Liberals the assembling of the council had at first been anticipated with satisfaction, in the hope that it would reform and re-state the doctrines of Trent. Acton expressed the feelings of many besides himself when he wrote : ' Three centuries have so changed the world that the maxims with which the Church resisted the Reformation have become her weakness and her reproach ; and that which arrested her decline now arrests her progress.' The opposition was strongest in France and Germany, where it was led by Döllinger, whose learning enabled him to impeach the ultramontanes not only for an uncritical habit and childish credulity, but for systematic dishonesty in the matter of documents. His Catholicism was unmistakable, and his *Church and the Churches* (1861) is most uncompromising in its defence of the Papacy by indictment of the condition of the peoples which were outside its jurisdiction. But to him, as to his friend and disciple Acton, ' truth was the one thing which gave dignity and

worth to history'; and no ecclesiastical expediency justified any tampering with historic truth. His *Pope-Fables of the Middle Ages* showed that he was becoming disillusioned; while *The Pope and the Council*, of which he was joint author, went further still, with its fuller information and its deeper motive; and the 'ecclesiastical history of his youth went to pieces against the new criticism of 1863 and the revelation of the unknown which began on a very large scale in 1864.'

When we come to look at this council we are at once struck by this fact: that out of 1000 votes¹ 334 were Italian. The Roman states, for instance, were represented by sixty-two bishops for a population of 700,000; whereas the Diocese of Breslau, containing 1,700,000 Catholics, were represented by one bishop! To Acton, who wrote a series of *Letters from Rome*, under the pseudonym Quirinus, to a Catholic journal, this one-sidedness destroyed all claim upon respect or even tolerance. 'Twenty Germans count for less than one

¹ The total number of members was about 1030: slightly over 700 attended the Council.

Italian' (p. 141). And this was accentuated by the poor quality of Italian Catholicism as he saw it. 'Here in Rome you may find a lottery dream-book in almost every house, but never a New Testament, and extremely seldom any religious book at all. . . . It seems as though it were a recognized principle that the more ignorant a people the greater must be the share their hierarchy have in the government of the Church' (p. 142).

Not only was it a one-sided council; it was a fettered council. Among other things Acton learned that since the proclamation of the council there had been appointed 'eighty-nine bishops *in partibus* whose flocks are in the moon or in Sirius.' In all there were three hundred bishops who, as the *Civiltà Cattolica* reminded them, depended upon the Pope for position, food, and lodging—a situation which we have already witnessed in connexion with the Council of Trent. Then there were fifteen cardinals' hats dangling before the members of the council, and eminently calculated to direct the operation of the Holy Ghost upon their minds! But not only was it fettered by

a subtle type of corrupt influence : it was also directly fettered by rules laid down by the Pope. The right of initiation was reserved to himself and his nominees ; no meeting of more than twenty bishops was permissible ; and when, because discussion was found to be futile on acoustic grounds in the hall of meeting, the bishops asked to be allowed to inspect stenographers' reports, this reasonable request was refused. The attitude of the majority, moreover, sunning itself in the favour of the Pope, was overbearing and contemptuous in the extreme towards those who opposed the dogma. 'Just consider the monstrosity !' said a young cardinal : 'the Archbishop of Paris dares to speak of rights which belong to him ! What would you say if one of your lackeys were to talk of his rights when you gave him your orders ?' And if it be answered that this was in Italy and from an Italian, it may be replied that Manning, preaching in Kensington just prior to the council, and speaking in the name of the Pope, said, 'I claim to be the supreme judge and arbiter of the consciences of men ; of the peasant that tills the field and

the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms—I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong.’ The two utterances are far enough apart in respect of manners; but in their substance and significance there is not much to choose between them.

No wonder that Newman complained as he did of an insolent faction! The records of the council, whether as reflected in Acton’s *Letters of Quirinus* and his essay on *The Vatican Council*, or in Manning’s *True History of the Vatican Council*, or in Dollinger’s *The Pope and the Council*, leave you with a very bad taste in your mouth; for they reek of tyranny, chicanery, worldliness, and thoroughgoing scepticism of the power of truth to assert itself. The conclusion of it all was obvious almost from the first. Many absented themselves from the final session; two prelates had the courage to vote against the promulgation of the dogma; and the vote was taken amid a thunderstorm which some likened to the manifestations of Sinai, others to those of Calvary!

When after the promulgation some bishops of the minority inquired of the Infallibilists whether they were bound now to teach all the syllabus, to accept the burning of heretics, &c., the answer came: *Toto devorato bove, turpe est in caudâ deficere?* ('You've swallowed the ox; why stick at the tail?') Why, indeed!!

The two decrees ran as follows: 'If any one shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only the right of inspection and direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also to the governance and order of the Church scattered over the whole world; or that he has only a larger share but not the whole fullness of this supreme power; or that this power of his is not normal and immediate either in relation to all and each of Churches, of pastors and of the faithful—let him be anathema!' And the second is like unto it: 'With the assent of the Sacred Council we ordain and define as a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*—that is

to say in his capacity (*fungens munere*) as pastor and teacher of all Christians; and, by his supreme apostolic authority and by divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, defines doctrine, whether as touching faith or morals to be observed by the Church; he is endowed with that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be instructed in the defining of doctrine as touching both faith and morals: and that on this account the definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves—and not by virtue of the consent of the Church—irrevocable. If any one shall presume to contradict this our definition—which God forbid—let him be anathema!’

The policy of the council was that of a powerful majority, but the numbers by no means represented the intellectual and spiritual character of the Church. There was bound to be a powerful revolt; and it came in what is known as Modernism, which the present Pope indicts, in his encyclical *Pascendi Gregis*, as the sum of all the heresies: and although a phase of such importance cannot

be adequately dealt with in these pages it is too closely related to what has gone before to be omitted from any estimate of papal aggression. Now, Modernism is not an opinion or a set of opinions, but a disposition, an attitude of mind; and it is this which gives it its importance, and at the same time causes the great diversity in its manifestations. One can easily imagine a well-informed progressive evangelical reading *Pascendi Gregis* and finding very little to quarrel with in its earlier portions—except for its crudity of thought and pomposity of manner. But while he profoundly disagrees with many of the speculations and conclusions which the Pope denounces, at the same time he will be in cordial sympathy with the attitude of mind, the spirit of earnest inquiry which lies behind the speculations. Take, for instance, the crucial case of Loisy. One may approve of the utmost freedom in investigation into the history of our sacred books, unhampered by any theory, whether of the schools or the market place, as to their origin; and at the same time utterly refuse to accept the sound-

ness of conclusions arrived at. One may acquit on any charge of moral or religious failure, and yet condemn on the charge of intellectual eccentricity. This distinction the Pope practically refuses to make. He finds certain opinions rife concerning Christianity on its philosophical, literary, and ecclesiastical sides—and many of those opinions would be as repugnant to us as to him; he sees them springing from one root, namely, independence of authority, the insolence of private judgement; and he has one remedy—more rigid discipline and censorship, and a more wholehearted adherence to the system of Thomas Aquinas! From his own point of view the Pope is right: and it is part of the nemesis on overweening ecclesiastical pretensions that they can only be sustained at the cost of ruthless intellectual repression. This Modernist attitude *is* the sum of all the heresies if the decrees of 1864 and 1870 are God's last word on religion. But it will require a force stronger than that of a Vatican council to carry out this policy, for the whole spirit of the age is against it. As Sir J. R. Seeley used to remind

his Political Science class at Cambridge, you cannot sit upon a safety-valve for an indefinite period: the time comes when you are 'removed,' though whether it is at the cost of a wrecking explosion or of your own destruction only depends upon circumstances. This is as true of the Papacy as it is of Russia, and observers of religious life abroad tell us with one voice that there is a gradual but persistent undermining of the allegiance of the educated classes to a Church which refuses to recognize facts and relies on intellectual repression.

If Loisy and the late Father Tyrrell represent Modernism on its biblical and philosophical sides, it is represented by Acton on a field perhaps wider than either of the others, because, although primarily historical, it practically includes them both. Acton was Sir J. R. Seeley's successor in the Chair of Modern History at Cambridge: and coming as professor to the university to which he had been refused admittance as a Catholic forty years before, he taught that no degree of fidelity to a cause atones for the use of crooked methods

in the support of it, however good that cause may be; and that truth alone gives dignity and worth to history. The conflict which Acton waged with Wiseman in 1864 over the *Home and Foreign Review* may be characterized as the first definite battle between English Modernism and the Roman hierarchy. As to the details of that conflict we need say no more than that Wiseman accused Acton, as editor, of systematically preferring the non-Catholic to the Catholic attitude; of walking and encouraging others to walk on the brink of error; and of generally making light of ecclesiastical authorities in matters of thought. Acton, sound Catholic that he was, bowed to his superior and discontinued the Review; but in its closing pages he gives what is in effect a noble vindication of the Modernist attitude of mind in its relations to all departments of life and thought. 'The principles of religion, government, and science are in harmony, always and inevitably; but their interests are not. And though all other interests must yield to those of religion, no principle can succumb to any interest. A political law or a scientific

truth may be perilous to morals or the faith of individuals, but it cannot on this ground be resisted by the Church. A discovery may be made in science which will shake the faith of thousands, yet religion cannot refuse it or object to it. The difference between a true and a false religion is this, that one judges all things by the touchstone of their truth, and the other by the touchstone of its own interests. A false religion fears the progress of all truth : a true religion seeks and recognizes truth wherever it can be found, and claims the power of regulating and controlling not the progress but the dispensation of knowledge. The Church both accepts the truth and prepares the individual to receive it.' And when he turned the light of these principles on to the history of the Papacy he found, to use his own words, that 'the passage from the Catholicism of the Fathers to that of the modern Popes was accomplished by wilful falsehood ; and the whole structure of traditions, laws and doctrines that support the theory of Infallibility and the practical despotism of the Popes stands on a basis of fraud.'

In other words, morals had been held of no account if only the interests of the ecclesiastical organization could be furthered. The 'fraudulent piety,' to use another of his phrases, which turns a blind eye to awkward facts, whether in the Bible or the history of the Church, was to him the unpardonable sin : and he threw the whole weight of his learning and his personality into the scales against those who were disposed to condone breaches of the moral law at the bidding of considerations of expediency. Modernism in him comes to close grips with Machiavelism in ecclesiastical and religious life : and the issue is one to which no one can be indifferent, seeing that the moral health of the race is at stake. If the Church be an exponent of chicanery, duplicity, disingenuousness, whence are men to learn rectitude, straightforwardness, and transparent honesty ? Rome has only itself to thank for the persistent suspicion and distrust which has come to transfer the term 'Jesuitical' from the ecclesiastical to the general vocabulary of men. That the individual Catholic necessarily stands on a

lower moral plane than his neighbour no sane Protestant would ever maintain; that the Jesuit is a man whose word can never be trusted and who is always plotting and devising some underground villany is a creation of the imagination excited by nerves. But that the Ultramontanism of the pontificate of Pius IX has been responsible for these views is indisputable; and in so far as the average Catholic becomes impregnated with the spirit which dominated the council, to that extent he imperils the character and the well-being of the community to which he belongs. It is too soon to say with any confidence whether Modernism will save the situation, whether a Roman Catholicism freed from Vaticanism can assert itself; but Acton was able to say, 'communion with Rome is dearer to me than life,' while all the time he was laying bare, as few have done, the evils of papal tyranny. And it may be that others will travel by that same road—and go farther.

X

CHRISTIANITY AS A MISSIONARY RELIGION

Four centuries of expansion geographically.

- (i) Catholics inherit traditions and workers—Foreign record finer than home—Special department created—New body of missionaries—Two centuries' monopoly (pp. 293-297).

Jesuits in southern and eastern Asia—Conciliate rulers, educate—Compromises with idolatry disliked by other missionaries—Africa and the slave trade—Idolatry exterminated in Mexico and Peru by the friars—Paraguay Reductions (pp. 298-307).

- (ii) Protestant emigration to the temperate zones—Negro appeals awaken the Moravians and Danes—South India—Voluntary societies, English and American—Recognition as Church duty, Methodist, Anglican and Presbyterian (pp. 307-311).
- (iii) Missionary results of three types—Wholesale capture of civilized states fails—Prolific backward races approached by Islam and Christianity—Aborigines outnumbered and absorbed—Interaction of political and religious aims—Native ministry, trained and ruling—Missionary fervour a test of vitality (pp. 311-316).

LECTURE X

CHRISTIANITY AS A MISSIONARY RELIGION

HITHERTO we have considered the changes of ecclesiastical life in the lands of Europe or her colonies, the development of Christianity among men of one race only. It is needful to give at least a glance at the geographical spread of the faith, to see how it proved able to meet the needs of other peoples. For Christianity from the first expressly claimed to be a universal religion. About A.D. 1500 the great mass of pagan nations in the background of the old world threw up into relief four religions, each in the main local: Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam. It is for us now to see how Christianity asserted itself as intended for all men, how it measured itself anew against these ancient foes, and how it assailed new strongholds in a new world.

The last four centuries of missionary effort have seen two very different methods of work, due to the old Church of Western Europe, and to the new Churches of Northern Europe. It must be briefly said with regret that the ancient Churches of Eastern Europe, of Western Asia, and of Northern Africa, have been and still remain quite negligible as missionary Churches. It will therefore be convenient to examine first the work of the Roman Catholics, then the work of the Reformed Churches, before we compare all the results irrespective of their origin, and observe the general advance of the faith in this last period.

I. ROMAN CATHOLIC

When the great disruption of the sixteenth century occurred, the Churches which adhered to the Roman obedience retained all the old traditions of missionary work, with most of the workers. Whatever may be said against the old system in lands where Christianity had long been established, yet on the frontiers of Christendom there were the most earnest workers, intent on the one fundamental problem, discipling all nations.

Never had this primary duty been quite forgotten or ignored. In every century there had been pioneers into some heathen land, generally rewarded with success. The actual work had been prosecuted by two bands of men: monks or friars, and soldiers. The court of Rome still commanded the services of both. If in some lands there was suppression of the monastic orders, and confiscation of the property they enjoyed, yet these catastrophes were not universal; while in the general shock it was felt that reform within their ranks was imperative if the remnant was to survive. As for the soldiery, although the Templars were long extinct, the Hospitallers were on the defensive in the Mediterranean, and the Knights of the Sword had dropped away from Rome, yet the cavaliers of Spain went forth under the banner of Sant Iago, and were led at this juncture across the 'Spanish main' to win new worlds for Christ and His vicar at Rome.

The Church of Rome, after the Reformation, never shows to finer advantage than on the mission field, where in the hour of most serious home disaster, the greatest triumphs were

won. In the city of Mexico Cortez failed terribly in a sortie from his fortress, and his machines came to irremediable grief; but with undaunted spirit he changed his plan, led his soldiery up the teocallis, and before the day was done had hurled the idols from their temples, and had won the most splendid victory that stands to his credit. It was an emblem of the success of Rome in the new world.

The authorities at Rome recognized that the unprecedented opportunities opening to them demanded new measures and new men. There was no slavish adherence to past methods. At head quarters the old machinery was examined, and new was invented. Some cardinals were told off into a Foreign Missions Committee as early as 1582, and within forty years this had developed into the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Perhaps devout Catholics might feel that the mutilation of their communion was no unmixed evil if it produced such a splendid reaction, such a throwing back to first principles. Henceforward the Church of Rome has always maintained this special department expressly to

plan for and to supervise the extension of Christianity.

Then the papal militia of monks and friars was supplemented by a new body of volunteers, the Company of Jesus. It was a Spanish soldier who planned this, and carried over the autocratic discipline with which he had been familiar. Spaniards thought imperially in those days, and while one side of the Jesuits' work lay in Europe, to reclaim dominion for the Pope, another lay beyond the seas, to make him in very truth the universal Bishop. One of the original members preached to the bounds of the East, others fared across the ocean to the discoveries of Columbus and Americus. Between the older orders and the new society there was a keen emulation which should plant the cross first in any new land.

And for two centuries there was no further challenge. The Reformed Churches were busy at other things, and did not seriously undertake missionary work. Whatever mission work was done till 1732 stands practically to the credit of the Roman Communion. Four specimen fields may be glanced at: in Eastern Asia, Africa, Mexico, and Southern America.

Francis Xavier opened up the sea route to India, China, and Japan for missionaries, and in his wake there streamed along many ardent followers. Some of them sheltered under the flag of European powers, in the Philippines, Macao, the East Indian Islands, or on the mainland at Goa. At first this promised well; the arm of the law could be relied upon to enforce measures that seemed good; and the Holy Inquisition, which had inquired so minutely into the genuineness of the conversion of the Moriscoes in Spain, was transplanted to the Indian coast to supervise the converts from heathenism or from the ancient Church of St. Thomas. But European wars spread here, and the Portuguese colonies largely fell to the Dutch, under whom, of course, Jesuit activity could not be open. The Dutch continued the same general policy and founded a missionary seminary at Leyden as early as 1612 to supply workers in Formosa and the chain of islands back to Ceylon. Such State-aided missions, though conducted by Protestants, were really a continuation of the Catholic work in these parts; and when the testing time came, it proved to be on equally

sandy foundations, and not even buttressed by the Bibles available in Formosan, Sinhalese, and Tamil.

The Jesuits, however, did not limit themselves to the outlying islands: they saw the importance of the great empires, and attempted to capture Japan, China, and India for Christ. Their plans were laid with skill, not to land haphazard or settle at any point where an opening presented itself, but to aim at the centres, and to influence the governing classes. Even as the apostle Paul so utilized his few active years as to plant Christian Churches at all the provincial capitals in the north-east of the empire, at Antioch, Tarsus, Salamis, Antioch of Galatia, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, besides incidentally founding others where he recognized the call of opportunity; so the Jesuits sought to comprehend which were the vital points in the Eastern empires, and to establish work there. Even as the apostle sought to conciliate the rulers, asiarchs at Ephesus, politarchs at Thessalonica, pro-consuls in Cyprus and Corinth and Caesarea, or threatened petty magistrates with the consequences of interference with a Roman citizen,

so the Jesuits sought to win the favour of the influential classes, including the governors and the very emperors themselves.

In Japan they succeeded in winning some of the feudal nobility, and brought pressure to bear on their retainers to create a Christian district. But the Dutch let the authorities know how the Jesuits employed force when they possessed it, and the Japanese had no mind to see a conflict between their State and a foreign potentate claiming dominion over the souls and bodies of his followers. This brought the mission to a close, and the Europeans were expelled, while a terrible persecution drove underground all Christianity in the native ranks, so that all propagation ceased till our own days, while tablets in every town denounced death on every follower of the Christian's god.

In China there was at first more success. The Jesuits recognized the national reverence for learning, and obtained leave to settle as students. While they devoted much time to the Chinese classics, they also began to spread Western learning, and very skilfully grafted this on to the native stock. Old astronomical

instruments dating from Kublai Khan were replaced by newer ones; the Empire was surveyed and a census organized for the better conduct of business. Better methods of casting metal were introduced, and it proved impossible to resist the imperial wish that their skill should superintend the arsenals whence the great wall was equipped against the northern raiders. The policy of conforming to local customs had another striking application when the Jesuits accepted the familiar reverences to the ancestral tablets as a salutary social custom, in full harmony with the command to honour father and mother. And having gone so far, it was easy next to tolerate the presence of statuettes of the Buddha, which according to strict Buddhistic principles were not really idols. But other missionaries thought the Jesuits were too pliable in these matters, and appealed to the authorities at Rome. When the Emperor found that his rulings were opposed by a foreigner, he too took alarm, and stopped all work, expelling all the missionaries. This caused a change of policy, and henceforth the efforts, not for a moment abandoned, had to

be secret ; nor could the governing classes be approached any longer, so that the only stratum available was the lower. So tenacious were the Chinese Christians, and so heroic the Jesuits, that steadily the propaganda went on, and when the embargo on work was removed by the Anglo-Chinese treaties, there were nearly a million of converts ready to organize. But in distinction from the policy of the old Church of St. Thomas, or the Protestant Churches, it would seem that no position of importance is really given to any Chinese ; after more than three hundred years the Catholic mission is still foreign at heart.

The policy in India was the same—to gain the ear of the rulers ; but society there was far more complex, owing to the system of vassals under the Mogul emperor, and to the caste divisions. Perhaps the first Briton to reach the interior here was an Oxford Jesuit. The literature of both north and south was studied by the missionaries, who proceeded to write new poems in the native style, which should convey Christian teaching. Unfortunately, their literary devices were thought to be hardly fair, and the poems have been dis-

credited as forgeries, instead of being appreciated as propaganda literature. Then others of the missionaries adopted native customs, on the same plan that was tried in China, and assumed rank as Brahmins; this involved concessions to Brahman prejudices and blocked the way to reaching the lower castes. Again, missionaries of other orders were found to impugn this policy, and the appeals to Rome proved the signal for a strife between parties in which, unhappily, the actual work was allowed to languish.

In these cases the missionaries were sent out from Spain and Portugal, and it is to be borne in mind that both kings and cavaliers were thoroughly in earnest about spreading the knowledge of the gospel. Prince Henry of Portugal, who planned the voyages of discovery, was equally zealous in planning for missionaries. His first successes were won on the west coast of Africa, where he planned to evangelize by means of negro missionaries. Unfortunately, in his eagerness to obtain these, he revived an old plan of ransoming slaves. This had the natural result of providing a supply of slaves, at first through the

Moors, but afterwards by direct traffic between the Portuguese and the slavers, or direct capture by Europeans. And thus there grew up a Portuguese slave trade which unhappily developed and far outshone the missions which had given rise to it. The Prince was so far justified in his enthusiasm, that expeditions penetrated up the Congo and Zambezi, and effected Christian settlements, winning several petty kings and giving promise that the negro bishops consecrated there would continue the work and spread inland. But again it was unfortunate that the Portuguese had not discerned that there were limitations to the negro character, and that the ease of tropic life would sap the energy even of those trained in Europe. The Portuguese dominion still endures on either shore, but the missions faded away, and by last century nothing remained outside the Portuguese settlements on the coast, except a few ruins and bells and crucifixes, no longer in use.

If the Portuguese explored the new route to the East Indies, the Spaniards, in seeking a route towards the setting sun, found the West Indies, then Mexico and Peru, and laid open

a New World to missionary effort. Here they met neither the ingrained conservatism of the East with its hoary religions, nor the shallow emotionalism of the negro ; and very different was the result of the missionary enterprise among the native races of America. Every ship that went out was bound to carry a quota of priests, and the friars made the West as thoroughly their field as the Jesuits made the East. On the islands the natives were soon exterminated by the forced labour imposed on them, and a negro population was imported to replace them. Again and again the missionaries sought to shield the poor slaves, though they accepted the general principle of slavery and even of the slave trade.

Force was employed freely to destroy the idolatry of Mexico. A few of the utensils were sent as trophies to Spain, but most of the furniture, idols, and temples were absolutely destroyed, while the priesthood was also exterminated. Nor was the house left empty, swept and garnished. Pictures and statues and crucifixes were introduced, catechisms were given to the children. Schools were opened, a university was founded, and every

device of the missionary was used with great success, except the vernacular Bible. But in Mexico, as in the East, many local customs were judged harmless and were taken over and pressed into Christian service.

In Peru the missionaries who accompanied Pizarro repeated the story. The temples of the sun were stripped of their golden symbols, the Incas were dethroned, and the prestige of their faith vanished. A splendid crucifix was sent out, and soon attracted veneration from the natives. Their idols were built into the foundations of cathedrals, their temples converted into monasteries and their convents into nunneries, while they were driven wholesale to be baptized. But again the old ceremonial was blended with the new; the sacred dances were performed in honour of a Spanish or Hebrew saint instead of an Inca god, the liquor was pea-nut beer or foreign fire-water instead of maize-wine; but the ritual was that consecrated by ages. And it must be acknowledged that the supply of missionaries fell far short of the needs, and that the natives trained for the priesthood did not fill the gap. Even to-day there are many places where there

is but one service held in each year, and where the inhabitants have perforce lapsed into a vague animism.

The most successful of these missions were on the Paraguay. Here the Jesuits aimed at self-supporting colonies, under the government of the native chiefs, who were, of course, under their influence. These were steadily increased, and the natives were trained to new industries. Thence, too, fresh expeditions went forth in search of wild tribes, to win them to civilization and to Christ. And as long as the Society of Jesus legally existed, so long did these missions illustrate the best side of its activity.

II. PROTESTANT

The Reformed Churches were much slower in taking up earnestly any extension work. They had no corporate traditions, they had to fight for bare existence in Europe, and thus there was much excuse for the long inaction. But it is not pleasant to remember that except for the Dutch taking over the obligations of the Portuguese in the East, scarcely anything was done; the only new enterprise was when

the English Commonwealth chartered a company to propagate the gospel in New England. Here, however, the work of Roger Williams and Eliot and Brainerd was quite outclassed by that of the Jesuits pushing up the St. Lawrence and down the Mississippi, or by the friars extending up the Pacific coast in after years.

Protestant expansion was not so much by the conversion of natives as by the wholesale emigration of Europeans; whereas Catholics used both methods. Gradually the temperate zone in North America, in South Africa, and in Australasia filled up with men chiefly from the Protestant stocks. The first awakening came through the Danes, with their tiny settlements in the West Indies and on the East Indian continent. A negro from St. Thomas found his way to Denmark, and there met a sympathetic hearer in Count Zinzendorf when he told the pagan condition of his fellow slaves. Zinzendorf went on to his home at Herrnhut, and told the Moravian refugees whom he was sheltering. These United Brethren recognized a call to foreign service, and some of their number actually sold them-

selves into slavery that they might obtain access to the poor heathen. From the Moravians the impulse passed to the Wesleys, and though they spent their personal energy chiefly among their own race, the Methodists began hesitatingly to tread the mission path.

In the East the Danish king protected German missionaries, and during the eighteenth century a few heroes like Ziegenbalg and Schwartz were laying foundations which have proved able to bear much superstructure; the Deccan was evangelized as far as their powers would allow, and Bibles were put out in three of the principal tongues, besides Portuguese. When troubles in Europe compelled Danes and Germans to slacken their efforts, the work was taken up by the English.

It is noteworthy that the awakening of English interest was not in ecclesiastical circles, but among private men. It was hard for William Carey to get a hearing at all among his brethren, and he only achieved his purpose by neglecting all existing Church machinery and founding a society whose sole purpose was the prosecution of foreign missions. The conception was important that if

existing Churches would not recognize this part of their duty, the duty must be discharged by those who realized it, independent of their Church connexions. If the first society was purely denominational, another was quickly established, quite universal in its membership. Their foundation was epoch-making, and Protestant missions leaped forth like Athene, fully equipped, in an incredibly short space of time. The Danes again were foster-fathers to the movement, and they granted a charter to a Christian university of Serampore, the first in Asia. Soon America entered into generous rivalry, and the Anglo-Saxon energy, so long spent in mere colonizing and trading, now found a worthier outlet in trading for the Master. Two great societies pushed out into other lands, and soon there was no country open to the gospel where one or other society was not represented, while on the frontiers of China men awaited the opening of the doors, or among the Muslims of the Mediterranean they risked their lives to strengthen the downtrodden Christian subjects and sap the strongholds of Islam.

The success of the voluntary societies roused

emulation among the more organized Protestant Churches. The Methodists were emboldened to take over official work which had been initiated on personal responsibility. The Anglicans, who had early in this era founded a Church Missionary Society, had also an older Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and these two in emulation made great strides and have been coming into closer relation with the authorities of the Church of England. So also the Presbyterian Churches in their highest courts have accepted corporate responsibility for extension; from Scotland, Germany, America, and Australia, missionaries have been sent forth, meeting in distant parts like Korea or the South Seas, and there promptly organizing new synods with fresh races won for Christ and converted into aggressive bands.

III. MISSIONARY RESULTS

There have been three types of work of widely different character, and of different degrees of success.

First, there have been attempts to capture whole civilized States, in the way that early Christianity captured the Roman Empire.

After the missionaries, then, had leavened part of the Empire, the rulers saw that they must come to terms, so Constantine broke with the old religion, built a new capital in the Christian provinces and adopted the new faith for the State. Similar hopes have been entertained as to the great Asiatic empires, but progress has been far slower. Japan may conceivably think it good policy to profess Christianity, and so assure her place among the Great Powers; but her people seem as yet far from being imbued with the Christian virtues. China has no such political motive, but the educated and ruling classes are for a brief time singularly receptive of Western influence, and may just now be ready to give Christianity a favourable hearing. India has no such unity, but yet presents unusual facilities for mission enterprise, as British rule or British treaties ensure fair play to the evangelist or educator. Persia seems to-day hardly to count as an empire; both there and in the other Muslim state, Turkey, politics are so entwined, owing to the law of Islam against conversion, that the prospects of Western Asia are hard to forecast. But in all these cases the task is

one which claims the greatest skill in planning and the greatest wisdom in the actual working. Those who have to deal with civilizations far older than the Christian, who find literatures more ancient than Homer, who know how often Christian missionaries have retired baffled, will not think that the conquest of the East for Christ is to be readily or quickly accomplished.

Very different is the problem of evangelizing the natives of Africa, South America, and the South Seas. They have no aboriginal religion of any vitality, though some have been inoculated with Islam or with what even Roman Catholics hesitate to call Catholicism. Here the chief obstacle is the vice of white men, showing itself in cruelty, slavery, lust and greed. It is hard for a simple savage to recognize easily the distinction between white and white, between the officer intent on rubber and the preacher of glad tidings. Yet this difficulty has been overcome, and the gospel commends itself in that its heralds are still the friends of the poor and the oppressed. There seems every reason to hope that Fiji, Madagascar, and Uganda are but earnest of abundant successes in this direction.

The third type of work is seen where the white race is displacing the aboriginal, and where in the vast areas of Canada, Australia, and Siberia the work may be classed as Home Mission. Under whatever name, it needs to be done ; the settler who goes away from the organized Churches must be followed up and encouraged to organize afresh. Unhappily, even in this obvious duty the Churches have shown themselves remiss, so that every now and again valleys are found where children have grown up without teaching or preaching or Bibles—we might almost say without God.

Whatever the type of work, it has often been found that motives are mixed, that some rulers will deliberately promote missions with an eye to increasing political influence or even annexation ; while missionaries are sometimes prepared to lean upon the secular arm. One of the best means of avoiding this risk is to regard the foreign missionary as a passing phenomenon, and to aim at the speedy establishment of a native ministry, setting the missionary free to push on and evangelize or organize elsewhere.

Perhaps this will explain the comparative

failure of some Catholic missions. There has been a backwardness in recognizing the right of the native since the ignominious end of the old Congo mission. We do not hear of Chinese, African, Aztec, Kechua bishops, even after four centuries of work among these peoples. Yet in Britain, within two hundred years of missions to the Welsh, there was at least one Welsh bishop; within one hundred years of missions to the English there were many English bishops. Unless we are ready to train a native ministry which shall be able to evangelize, to educate, and to direct, we fail to profit by the lessons of the past. And this is the explanation of the stress thrown on educational missions. From the ranks of Gamaliel's pupils, not from the fishermen of Galilee, came the statesman who moulded the thought of the early Church and impressed upon her the missionary ideal. From Christian colleges at Tokio or Hwang-hien, or Madras or Serampore or Beirut, we may in all human likelihood expect the native who will with comprehension of his fellows lead them on to glorious warfare for Christ.

The missionary spirit is the divine test of a

Church's vitality. A great reformer generalized from his own experience and declared that the test of a standing or falling Church was her acceptance of the dogma of justification by faith; it was a pardonable assumption, which cannot be proved. But the risen Lord reiterated, on every occasion when He is recorded to have spoken with His disciples, the charge to go and proclaim salvation to all men. Any organization which neglects this duty may have a genuine pedigree back to apostolic days, but has no part nor lot in the promise, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age,' which promise is linked with the order to make disciples of all nations. But those who are busy witnessing, whether at home or amongst rival faiths, or at the uttermost parts of the earth, testify to the power of the Spirit within, and show that they are members of that Body which is ever building itself up in love.

INDEX

- ACTON : verdicts, 12, 21, 48,
 64, 71, 100, 105, 129;
 actions, 276 ff
 Africa, 294, 303, 313
 America, 91, 112, 115, 118,
 152 ff, 295
 Anabaptists, 71, 75, 101 ff,
 115, 124
 Antichrist, 111, 237, 251
 Apostolic Succession, 220,
 235, 243, 316
 Arminianism, 90, 139, 205
 Arnold of Rugby, 229, 249
 Atheism, 163, 170, 173
 Augsburg conferences, 20, 44,
 101

 Baptists, 115 ff, 158, 309
 Bentham, 229 ff
 Blount, 171
 Bolingbroke, 190
 Boyle lectures, 163
 Brownism, 108 ff
 Butler, 170, 189, 191, 197

 Calvin, 69 ff
 Cambridge Platonists, 183
 Campeggio, 25
 Carey, 309
 Cartwright, 82, 93, 109
 Charles V, 16, 43, 51, 56,
 104
 China, 300, 312

 Chubb, 175
 Church discipline, 74, 83, 102,
 110, 116, 134
 Church government, 75, 81,
 86 ff, 99, 105, 114, 124, 142,
 229, 311, 314
 Church and state, 102, 113,
 121, 123 ff, 153, 157, 227,
 263
 Clarendon code, 141-146
 Collins, 176, 182
 Contarini, 45 ff, 62
 Conventicle acts, 109, 145,
 148
 Croft of Hereford, 142, 164
 Cudworth, 185

 Danish missions, 308 ff
 Deism, 163 ff
 Descartes, 179
 Döllinger, 39, 276, 280

 Education, 158, 246, 264, 298,
 300, 305, 310, 315
 Elizabeth, 36, 61, 81 ff, 126

 Foster v. Tindal, 168
 France, 70, 76, 81, 149, 261
 Friars, 44, 69, 295
 Friends, Society of, 119 ff,
 144, 186
 Froude, 231, 236, 249

- Gathered churches, 115 ff
 Gladstone, 246
 Grafton, 196

 Hampden controversy, 245
 Hampton conference, 88
 Henry VIII, 24, 29, 126
 Herbert of Cherburg, 182
 High church doctrine, 125,
 204, 251 ff, 230 ff, 270 ff
 Hoadley of Bangor, 165
 Hooker, Richard, 94, 230
 Hooker, Thomas, 115
 Hooper, 32
 Humanism, 47, 70

 Immaculate conception, 271
 Independents, 100, 112 ff, 157
 Index of forbidden books, 64
 India, 298, 302, 309, 312
 Infallibility, 238, 274 ff
 Inquisition, 61, 298
 Irreligion, 191, 195

 Japan, 300, 312
 Jesuits, 22, 50, 54, 57 ff, 99,
 265, 271, 288, 297 ff
 Justification by faith, 45, 105,
 316

 Keble, 233, 242
 Knox, 77

 Lardner, 174
 Laud, 91, 230
 Lay preaching, 118, 208
 Leslie and the Deists, 178
 Liberty of conscience, 154,
 159, 165, 180, 267, 273, 284
 Locke, 181
 Loisy, 283
 Lollards, 105, 113
 Loyola, 54, 57 ff, 69, 102
 Luther, 11 ff, 47, 57, 69, 107,
 115, 316

 Manning, 255, 275, 279
 Marprelate tracts, 86
 Maurice, 246
 Methodists, 158, 208 ff, 309,
 311
 Mexico, 296, 304
 Millenarians, 103, 123, 136,
 187
 Modernism, 282
 Monasticism, 128, 295
 Moravians, 205, 308

 Nantes, Edict of, 76, 149
 Napoleon, 17, 262 ff
 Netherlands, 62
 New England, 91, 112, 153 ff,
 308
 Newman, 233, 242, 247,
 250 ff, 280
 Nonconformity, 38
 Nonjurors, 150, 178, 187

 Oxford Movement, 227 ff

 Paley, 175, 178, 182, 247
 Palmer the Tractarian, 228,
 238, 247
 Paraguay, 307
 Peru, 306
 Pius IX, 267 ff
 Pole the Cardinal, 34, 45, 47
 Praemunire, 24
 Prayer-book revision, 33, 78,
 89, 229, 233
 Presbyterianism, 75 ff, 134,
 144, 151, 158, 311
 Propagandism, 118, 120, 129,
 158, 207, 293 ff
 Prophecyings, 83, 118, 134
 'Protestants,' 20
 Pusey, 239, 253

 Ranke, 49
 Reaction, 47, 66

- Sabbath controversy, 89
 Savoy conferences, 113, 143
 Schmalkald, 30
 Scotland, 78 ff, 89 ff, 144, 148
 Separation from the Church,
 111, 116, 156, 216
 Sheldon, 141, 146
 Sherlock, 177
 South, 188
 Speyer, 19
 Spinoza, 180
 Swift, 188
 Syllabus of errors, 272

 Tillotson, 189
 Tindal, 167
 Toland, 172
Tracts for the Times, 235, 242
 Trent, 47 ff, 73, 251

 Uniformity, 37, 87, 89, 143,
 150

 Vatican council, 274 ff
 Vernacular Bible, 31, 35, 79,
 89, 101, 105, 299, 306, 309
 Voluntaryism, 84, 309

 Walpole, 190, 195
 Ward's *Ideal Church*, 253
 Wesley, 201 ff
 Westminster standards, 73,
 92, 113
 Whichcote, 183
 Whiston, 187
 Whitefield, 156, 205
 Whitgift, 86, 111
 Wiseman, 237, 251, 270, 286
 Woolston, 177

 Xavier, 298
 Ximenes, 44
 XXXIX Articles, 83, 104,
 245

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
 CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A023505

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

BR
290
M6

Moulton, William Fiddian, b.1866.

Studies in modern Christendom; being a series of lectures delivered in connexion with the Liverpool Board of Biblical Studies, Lent Term 1909, by W. Fiddian Moulton and W.T. Whitley. [1st ed.] London, R. Culley [1910] 319p. 21cm.

Includes index.

1. Church history--Modern period, 1500-
--Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Whitley
William Thomas, b. 1861. II. Liverpool
Board of Biblical Studies. III. Title.
CCSC/mmb

A023505

A023505

